

Blow up dynamics for equivariant critical Schrödinger maps

Galina Perelman*

Abstract

For the Schrödinger map equation $u_t = u \times \Delta u$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2+1}$, with values in S^2 , we prove for any $\nu > 1$ the existence of equivariant finite time blow up solutions of the form $u(x, t) = \phi(\lambda(t)x) + \zeta(x, t)$, where ϕ is a lowest energy steady state, $\lambda(t) = t^{-1/2-\nu}$ and $\zeta(t)$ is arbitrary small in $\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2$.

1 Introduction

1.1 Setting of the problem and statement of the result

In this paper we consider the Schrödinger flow for maps from $\mathbb{R}^2$ to S^2 :

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= u \times \Delta u, \quad x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u|_{t=0} &= u_0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $u(x, t) = (u_1(x, t), u_2(x, t), u_3(x, t)) \in S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.

Equation (1.1) conserves the energy

$$E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx |\nabla u|^2. \tag{1.2}$$

The problem is critical in the sense that both (1.1) and (1.2) are invariant with respect to the scaling $u(x, t) \rightarrow u(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

*LAMA, UMR CNRS 8050, Université Paris-Est Créteil, 61, avenue du Général de Gaulle, 94010 Créteil Cedex, France

To a finite energy map $u : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow S^2$ one can associate the degree:

$$\deg(u) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx u_{x_1} \cdot J_u u_{x_2},$$

where J_u is defined by

$$J_u v = u \times v, \quad v \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

It follows from (1.2) that

$$E(u) \geq 4\pi |\deg(u)|. \quad (1.3)$$

This inequality is saturated by the harmonic maps ϕ_m , $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_m(x) &= e^{m\theta R} Q^m(r), \quad Q^m = (h_1^m, 0, h_3^m) \in S^2, \\ h_1^m(r) &= \frac{2r^m}{r^{2m} + 1}, \quad h_3^m(r) = \frac{r^{2m} - 1}{r^{2m} + 1}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

Here (r, θ) are polar coordinates in $\mathbb{R}^2$: $x_1 + ix_2 = e^{i\theta} r$, and R is the generator of the horizontal rotations:

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

or equivalently

$$Ru = k \times u, \quad k = (0, 0, 1).$$

One has

$$\deg \phi_m = m, \quad E(\phi_m) = 4\pi m.$$

Up to the symmetries ϕ_m are the only energy minimizers in their homotopy class.

Since ϕ_1 will play a central role in the analysis developed in this paper, we set $\phi = \phi_1$, $Q = Q_1$, $h_1 = h_1^1$, $h_3 = h_3^1$.

The local/global well-posedness of (1.1) has been extensively studied in past years. Local existence for smooth initial data goes back to [18], see also [14]. The case of small data of low regularity was studied in several works, the definite result being obtained by Bejenaru, Kenig and Tataru in [3], where the global existence and scattering was proved for general $\dot{H}^1$ small initial data. Global existence for equivariant small energy initial data was proved

earlier in [6] (by m -equivariant map $u : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ one means a map of the form $u(x) = e^{m\theta R}v(r)$, where $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, m -equivariance being preserved by the Schrödinger flow (1.1)). In the radial case $m = 0$, the global existence for H^2 data was established by Gustafson and Koo [11]. Very recently, Bejenaru, Ionescu, Kenig and Tataru [4] proved global existence and scattering for equivariant data with energy less than 4π . The dynamics of m -equivariant Schrödinger maps with initial data close to ϕ_m was studied by Gustafson, Kang, Nakanishi, and Tsai [9], [10], [12] and later by Bejenaru, Tataru [5] in the case $m = 1$. The stability/instability results of these works strongly suggest a possibility of regularity breakdown in solutions of (1.1) via concentration of the lowest energy harmonic map ϕ . For a closely related model of wave maps this type of regularity breakdown was proved by Kriger, Schlag and Tataru [13] and by Raphael and Rodnianski [17]. These authors showed the existence of 1- equivariant blow up solutions close to $\phi(\lambda(t)x)$ with $\lambda(t) \sim \frac{e^{\sqrt{|\ln(T^*-t)|}}}{T^*-t}$ as $t \rightarrow T^*$ [17], and with $\lambda(t) \sim \frac{1}{(T^*-t)^{1+\nu}}$ as $t \rightarrow T^*$ where $\nu > 1/2$ can be chosen arbitrarily [13] (here T^* is the blow up time). While the blow up dynamics exhibited in [17] is stable (in some strong topology), the continuum of blow up solutions constructed by Kriger, Schlag and Tataru is believed to be non-generic. Recently, the results of [17] were generalized to the case of Schrödinger map equation (1.1) by Merle, Raphael and Rodnianski in [15] where they proved the existence of 1-equivariant blow up solutions of (1.1) close to $\phi(\lambda(t)x)$ with $\lambda(t) \sim \frac{(\ln(T^*-t))^2}{T^*-t}$.

Our objective in this paper is to show that (1.1) also admits 1-equivariant Kriger-Schlag-Tataru type blow up solutions that correspond to certain initial data of the form

$$u_0 = \phi + \zeta_0,$$

where ζ_0 is 1-equivariant and can be chosen arbitrarily small in $\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^3$. Let us recall (see [9], [10], [12], [5]) that such initial data result in unique local solution of the same regularity, and as long as the solution exists it stays $\dot{H}^1$ close to a two parameter family of 1-equivariant harmonic maps $\phi^{\alpha,\lambda}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ generated from ϕ by rotations and scaling:

$$\phi^{\alpha,\lambda}(r, \theta) = e^{\alpha R} \phi(\lambda r, \theta).$$

The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $\nu > 1$, $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and any $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small there exist $t_0 > 0$ and a 1-equivariant solution $u \in C((0, t_0], \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^3)$ of*

(1.1) of the form:

$$u(x, t) = e^{\alpha(t)R} \phi(\lambda(t)x) + \zeta(x, t), \quad (1.5)$$

where

$$\lambda(t) = t^{-1/2-\nu}, \quad \alpha(t) = \alpha_0 \ln t, \quad (1.6)$$

$$\|\zeta(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2} \leq \delta, \quad \|\zeta(t)\|_{\dot{H}^3} \leq C_{\nu, \alpha_0} t^{-1}, \quad \forall t \in (0, t_0]. \quad (1.7)$$

Furthermore, as $t \rightarrow 0$, $\zeta(t) \rightarrow \zeta^*$ in $\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2$ with $\zeta^* \in H^{1+2\nu-}$.

Remark 1.2. In fact, using the arguments developed in this paper one can show that the same result remains valid with $\dot{H}^3$ replaced by $\dot{H}^{1+2s}$ for any $1 \leq s < \nu$.

1.2 Strategy of the proof

The proof of Theorem 1.1 contains two main steps. The first step is a construction of an approximate solutions $u^{(N)}$ that have form (1.5), (1.6), (1.7), and solve (1.1) up to an arbitrarily high order error $O(t^N)$, very much in the spirit of the work of Kriger, Schlag and Tataru [13].

The second step is to build the exact solution by solving the problem for the small remainder forward in time with zero initial data at $t = 0$. The control of remainder is achieved by means of suitable energy type estimates, see section 3 for the detail.

2 Approximate solutions

2.1 Preliminaries

We consider (1.1) under the 1-equivariance assumption

$$u(x, t) = e^{\theta R} v(r, t), \quad v = (v_1, v_2, v_3) \in S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3. \quad (2.1)$$

Restricted to the 1-equivariant functions (1.1) takes the form

$$v_t = v \times (\Delta v + \frac{R^2}{r^2} v), \quad (2.2)$$

the energy being given by

$$E(u) = \pi \int_0^\infty dr r (|v_r|^2 + \frac{v_1^2 + v_2^2}{r^2}).$$

$Q = (h_1, 0, h_3)$ is a stationary solution of (2.2) and one has the relations

$$\partial_r h_1 = -\frac{h_1 h_3}{r}, \quad \partial_r h_3 = \frac{h_1^2}{r}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\Delta Q + \frac{R^2}{r^2} Q = \kappa(r) Q, \quad \kappa(r) = -\frac{2h_1^2}{r^2}. \quad (2.4)$$

The goal of the present section is to prove the following result.

Proposition 2.1. *For any $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small and any N sufficiently large there exists an approximate solution $u^{(N)} : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+^* \rightarrow S^2$ of (1.1) such that the following holds.*

(i) $u^{(N)}$ is a C^∞ 1-equivariant profile of the form: $u^{(N)} = e^{\alpha(t)R}(\phi(\lambda(t)x) + \chi^{(N)}(\lambda(t)x, t))$, where $\chi^{(N)}(y, t) = e^{\theta R} Z^{(N)}(\rho, t)$, $\rho = |y|$, verifies

$$\|\partial_\rho Z^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho)}, \|\rho^{-1} Z^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho)}, \|\rho \partial_\rho Z^{(N)}(t)\|_\infty \leq C\delta^{2\nu}, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\|\rho^{-l} \partial_\rho^k Z^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho)} \leq C\delta^{2\nu-1} t^{1/2+\nu}, \quad k+l=2, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\|\rho^{-l} \partial_\rho^k Z^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho)} \leq C t^{2\nu}, \quad k+l=3, \quad (2.7)$$

$$\|\partial_\rho Z^{(N)}(t)\|_\infty, \|\rho^{-1} Z^{(N)}(t)\|_\infty \leq C\delta^{2\nu-1} t^\nu, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\|\rho^{-l} \partial_\rho^k Z^{(N)}(t)\|_\infty \leq C t^{2\nu}, \quad 2 \leq l+k \leq 3, \quad (2.9)$$

for any $0 < t \leq T(N, \delta)$ with some $T(N, \delta) > 0$. The constants C here and below are independent of N and δ .

In addition, one has

$$\|\chi^{(N)}(t)\|_{\dot{W}^{4,\infty}} + \|\langle y \rangle^{-1} \chi^{(N)}(t)\|_{\dot{W}^{5,\infty}} \leq C t^{2\nu}, \quad (2.10)$$

and $\langle x \rangle^{2(\nu-1)} \nabla^4 u^{(N)}(t), \langle x \rangle^{2(\nu-1)} \nabla^2 u_t^{(N)}(t) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Furthermore, there exists $\zeta_N^* \in \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^{1+2\nu-}$ such that as $t \rightarrow 0$, $e^{\alpha(t)R} \chi^{(N)}(\lambda(t)\cdot, t) \rightarrow \zeta_N^*$ in $\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2$.

(ii) The corresponding error $r^{(N)} = -u_t^{(N)} + u^{(N)} \times \Delta u^{(N)}$ verifies

$$\|r^{(N)}(t)\|_{H^3} + \|\partial_t r^{(N)}(t)\|_{H^1} + \|\langle x \rangle r^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq t^N, \quad 0 < t \leq T(\delta, N). \quad (2.11)$$

Remarks.

1. Note that estimates (2.5), (2.6) imply:

$$\|u^{(N)}(t) - e^{\alpha(t)R} \phi(\lambda(t)\cdot)\|_{\dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^2} \leq \delta^{2\nu-1}, \quad \forall t \in (0, T(N, \delta)]. \quad (2.12)$$

2. It follows from our construction that $\chi^{(N)}(t) \in \dot{H}^{1+2s}$ for any $s < \nu$ with the estimate $\|\chi^{(N)}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{1+2s}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C(t^{2\nu} + t^{s(1+2\nu)}\delta^{2\nu-2s})$.
3. The remainder $r^{(N)}$ verifies in fact, for any m, l, k ,

$$\| \langle x \rangle^l \partial_t^m r^{(N)}(t) \|_{H^k} \leq C_{l,m,k} t^{N-C_{l,m,k}},$$

provided $N \geq C_{l,m,k}$.

We will give the proof of proposition 2.1 in the case of ν irrational only, which allows to slightly simplify the presentation. The extension to ν rational is straightforward.

To construct an arbitrarily good approximate solution we analyze separately the three regions that correspond to three different space scales: the inner region with the scale $r\lambda(t) \lesssim 1$, the self-similar region where $r = O(t^{1/2})$, and finally the remote region where $r = O(1)$. The inner region is the region where the blowup concentrates. In this region the solution will be constructed as a perturbation of the profile $e^{\alpha(t)R}Q(\lambda(t)r)$. The self-similar and remote regions are the regions where the solution is close to k and is described essentially by the corresponding linearized equation. In the self-similar region the profile of the solution will be determined uniquely by the matching conditions coming out of the inner region, while in the remote region the profile remains essentially a free parameter of the construction, only the limiting behavior at the origin is prescribed by the matching process, see subsections 2.3 and 2.4 for the details, see also [1], [2] for some closely related considerations in the context of the critical harmonic map heat flow.

2.2 Inner region $r\lambda(t) \lesssim 1$

We start by considering the inner region $0 \leq r\lambda(t) \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1}$, where $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \nu$ to be fixed later. Writing $v(r, t)$ as

$$v(r, t) = e^{\alpha(t)R}V(\lambda(t)r, t), \quad V = (V_1, V_2, V_3),$$

we get from (2.2)

$$t^{1+2\nu}V_t + \alpha_0 t^{2\nu}RV - (\nu + \frac{1}{2})\rho V_\rho = V \times (\Delta V + \frac{R^2}{\rho^2}V), \quad \rho = \lambda(t)r. \quad (2.13)$$

We look for a solution of (2.13) as a perturbation of the harmonic map profile $Q(\rho)$. Write

$$V = Q + Z,$$

and further decompose Z as

$$Z(\rho, t) = z_1(\rho, t)f_1(\rho) + z_2(\rho, t)f_2(\rho) + \gamma(\rho, t)Q(\rho),$$

where f_1, f_2 is the orthonormal frame on $T_Q S^2$ given by

$$f_1(\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} h_3(\rho) \\ 0 \\ -h_1(\rho) \end{pmatrix} \quad f_2(\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

On has

$$\gamma = \sqrt{1 - |z|^2} - 1 = O(|z|^2), \quad z = z_1 + iz_2.$$

Note also the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\rho Q &= -\frac{h_1}{\rho}f_1, \quad \partial_\rho f_1 = \frac{h_1}{\rho}Q, \quad f_2 = Q \times f_1, \\ \Delta f_1 + \frac{R^2}{\rho^2}f_1 &= -\frac{1}{\rho^2}f_1 - \frac{2h_3h_1}{\rho^2}Q. \end{aligned}$$

Rewriting (2.13) in terms of z one gets:

$$\begin{aligned} it^{1+2\nu}z_t - \alpha_0 t^{2\nu}h_3z - i\left(\frac{1}{2} + \nu\right)t^{2\nu}\rho z_\rho &= Lz + F(z) + dt^{2\nu}h_1, \\ L &= -\Delta + \frac{1 - 2h_1^2}{\rho^2}, \quad d = \alpha_0 - i\left(\frac{1}{2} + \nu\right), \\ F(z) &= \gamma Lz + z\left(\Delta\gamma + \frac{2h_1}{\rho}\partial_\rho z_1 - \frac{2h_1h_3z_1}{\rho^2}\right) + \frac{2h_1}{\rho}(1 + \gamma)\gamma_\rho + dt^{2\nu}\gamma h_1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Note that F is at least quadratic in z .

We look for a solution of (2.14) as a power expansion in $t^{2\nu}$:

$$z(\rho, t) = \sum_{k \geq 1} t^{2\nu k} z^k(\rho). \tag{2.15}$$

Substituting (2.15) into (2.14) we get the following recurrent system for $z^k, k \geq 1$:

$$Lz^1 = dh_1, \tag{2.16}$$

$$Lz^k = \mathcal{F}_k, \quad k \geq 2, \tag{2.17}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_k$ depends on $z^j, j = 1, \dots, k-1$ only. We subject (2.16), (2.17) to zero initial conditions at $\rho = 0$:

$$z^k(0) = \partial_\rho z^k(0) = 0. \tag{2.18}$$

Lemma 2.2. *System (2.16), (2.17), (2.18) has a unique solution $(z^k)_{k \geq 1}$, with $z^k \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ for all $k \geq 1$. In addition, one has:*
(i) z^k has an odd Taylor expansion at 0 that starts at order $2k + 1$;
(ii) as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, z^k has the following asymptotic expansion

$$z^k(\rho) = \sum_{l=0}^{2k} \sum_{j \leq k - (l-1)/2} c_{j,l}^k \rho^{2j-1} (\ln \rho)^l, \quad (2.19)$$

with some constants $c_{j,l}^k$. The asymptotic expansion (2.19) can be differentiated any number of times with respect to ρ .

Proof. First note that the equation $Lf = 0$ has two explicit solutions: $h_1(\rho)$ and $h_2(\rho) = \frac{\rho^4 + 4\rho^2 \ln \rho - 1}{\rho(\rho^2 + 1)}$.

Consider the case $k = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} Lz^1 &= dh_1, \\ z^1(0) &= \partial_\rho z^1(0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

One has

$$\begin{aligned} z^1(\rho) &= \frac{d}{4} \int_0^\rho ds (h_1(\rho)h_2(s) - h_1(s)h_2(\rho))h_1(s) \\ &= \frac{d\rho}{(1+\rho^2)} \int_0^\rho ds \frac{s(s^4 + 4s^2 \ln s - 1)}{(1+s^2)^2} - \frac{d(\rho^4 + 4\rho^2 \ln \rho - 1)}{\rho(\rho^2 + 1)} \int_0^\rho ds \frac{s^3}{(1+s^2)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Since h_1 is a C^∞ function that has an odd Taylor expansion at $\rho = 0$ with a linear leading term, one can easily write an odd Taylor series for z^1 with a cubic leading term, which proves (i) for $k = 1$.

The asymptotic behavior of z^1 at infinity can be obtained directly from the representation (2.20). As claimed, one has

$$z^1(\rho) = c_{1,0}^1 \rho + c_{1,1}^1 \rho \ln \rho + \sum_{j \leq 0} \sum_{l=0,1,2} c_{j,l}^1 \rho^{2j-1} (\ln \rho)^l,$$

with $c_{1,0}^1 = -c_{1,1}^1 = d_1$.

Consider $k > 1$. Assume that z^j , $j \leq k - 1$, verify (i) and (ii). Then, using (2.14), one can easily check that $\mathcal{F}_k$ is an odd C^∞ function vanishing

at $\rho = 0$ at order $2k - 1$, with the following asymptotic expansion as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_k &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sum_{l=0}^{2k-2j-1} \alpha_{j,l}^k \rho^{2j-1} (\ln \rho)^l + \sum_{l=0}^{2k-2} \alpha_{0,l}^k \rho^{-1} (\ln \rho)^l \\ &+ \sum_{l=0}^{2k-1} \alpha_{-1,l}^k \rho^{-3} (\ln \rho)^l + \sum_{j=-2}^{2k} \sum_{l=0}^{2k} \alpha_{j,l}^k \rho^{2j-1} (\ln \rho)^l.\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, $z^k(\rho) = \frac{1}{4} \int_0^\rho ds s (h_1(\rho) h_2(s) - h_1(s) h_2(\rho)) \mathcal{F}_k(s)$ is a C^∞ function with an odd Taylor series at zero starting at order $2k + 1$ and as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$,

$$z^k(\rho) = \sum_{l=0}^{2k} \sum_{j \leq k-(l-1)/2} c_{j,l}^k (\ln \rho)^l \rho^{2j-1},$$

as required. This concludes the proof of lemma 2.2. $\square$

Returning to v we get a formal solution of (2.2) of the form

$$v(r, t) = e^{\alpha(t)R} V(\lambda(t)r, t), \quad V(\rho, t) = Q + \sum_{k \geq 1} t^{2\nu k} Z^k(\rho), \quad (2.21)$$

$Z^k = (Z_1^k, Z_2^k, Z_3^k)$, where Z_i^k , $i = 1, 2$, are smooth odd functions of ρ vanishing at 0 at order $2k + 1$, and Z_3^k is an even function vanishing at zero at order $2k + 2$. As $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}Z_i^k(\rho) &= \sum_{l=0}^{2k} \sum_{j \leq k-(l-1)/2} c_{j,l}^{k,i} (\ln \rho)^l \rho^{2j-1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ Z_3^k(\rho) &= \sum_{l=0}^{2k} \sum_{j \leq k+1-l/2} c_{j,l}^{k,3} (\ln \rho)^l \rho^{2j-2},\end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

with some real coefficients $c_{j,l}^{k,i}$ verifying

$$c_{k+1,0}^{k,3} = 0, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

The asymptotic expansions (2.22) can be differentiated any number of times with respect to ρ .

Note that in the limit $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, $y \equiv rt^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0$, expansion (2.21), (2.22) give at least formally

$$\begin{aligned}
V_i(\lambda(t)r, t) &= \sum_{j \geq 0} t^{\nu(2j+1)} \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} (\ln y - \nu \ln t)^l V_i^{j,l}(y), \quad i = 1, 2, \\
V_3(\lambda(t)r, t) &= 1 + \sum_{j \geq 1} t^{2\nu j} \sum_{l=0}^{2j} (\ln y - \nu \ln t)^l V_3^{j,l}(y), \\
V_i^{j,l}(y) &= \sum_{k \geq -j+l/2} c_{k,l}^{k+j,i} y^{2k-1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \\
V_3^{j,l}(y) &= \sum_{k \geq -j+l/2} c_{k+1,l}^{k+j,3} y^{2k},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

where the coefficients $c_{j,l}^{k,i}$ with $k \neq 0$ are defined by (2.22) and $c_{j,0}^{0,i}$ come from the expansion of Q as $\rho \rightarrow \infty$:

$$h_1(\rho) = \sum_{j \leq 0} c_{j,0}^{0,1} \rho^{2j-1}, \quad h_3(\rho) = 1 + \sum_{j \leq 0} c_{j,0}^{0,3} \rho^{2j-2}, \quad c_{j,0}^{0,2} = 0.$$

For $N \geq 2$ define

$$z_{in}^{(N)} = \sum_{k=1}^N z^k, \quad z_{in}^{(N)} = z_{in,1}^{(N)} + i z_{in,2}^{(N)}.$$

Then $z_{in}^{(N)}$ solves (2.14) up to the error $X_N = -it^{1+2\nu} \partial_t z_{in}^{(N)} - \alpha_0 t^{2\nu} h_3 z_{in}^{(N)} + i(\frac{1}{2} + \nu) t^{2\nu} \rho \partial_\rho z_{in}^{(N)} + dt^{2\nu} h_1 + L z_{in}^{(N)} + F(z_{in}^{(N)})$, verifying

$$|\rho^{-l} \partial_\rho^k \partial_t^m X_N| \leq C_{k,l,m} t^{2\nu N - m} < \rho >^{2N-1-l-k} \ln(2 + \rho), \tag{2.24}$$

for any $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq l \leq (2N + 1 - k)_+$, $0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1}$, $0 < t \leq T(N)$, with some $T(N) > 0$.

Set

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{in}^{(N)} &= \sqrt{1 - |z_{in}^{(N)}|^2} - 1, \\
Z_{in}^{(N)} &= z_{in,1}^{(N)} f_1 + z_{in,2}^{(N)} f_2 + \gamma_{in}^{(N)} Q, \\
V_{in}^{(N)} &= Q + Z_{in}^{(N)} \in S^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then $V_{in}^{(N)}$ solves

$$t^{1+2\nu}\partial_t V_{in}^{(N)} + \alpha_0 t^{2\nu} R V_{in}^{(N)} - (\nu + \frac{1}{2})\rho\partial_\rho V_{in}^{(N)} = V_{in}^{(N)} \times (\Delta_\rho V_{in}^{(N)} + \frac{R^2}{\rho^2} V_{in}^{(N)}) + \mathcal{R}_{in}^{(N)}, \quad (2.25)$$

with $\mathcal{R}_{in}^{(N)} = \text{im } X_N f_1 - \text{re } X_N f_2 + \frac{\text{im}(\bar{X}_N z^{(N)})}{1+\gamma^{(N)}} Q$ admitting the same estimate as X_N . Note also that it follows from our analysis that for $0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1}$, $0 < t \leq T(N)$,

$$|\rho^{-l}\partial_\rho^k Z_{in}^{(N)}| \leq C_{k,l} t^{2\nu} < \rho >^{1-l-k} \ln(2+\rho), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad l \leq (3-k)_+. \quad (2.26)$$

As a consequence, we obtain the following result.

Lemma 2.3. *There exists $T(N) > 0$ such that for any $0 < t \leq T(N)$ the following holds.*

(i) *The profile $Z_{in}^{(N)}(\rho, t)$ verifies*

$$\|\partial_\rho Z_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho, 0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1})} \leq Ct^\nu, \quad (2.27)$$

$$\|\rho^{-1} Z_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho, 0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1})} \leq Ct^\nu, \quad (2.28)$$

$$\|Z_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1})} + \|\rho\partial_\rho Z_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1})} \leq Ct^\nu, \quad (2.29)$$

$$\|\rho^{-l}\partial_\rho^k Z_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho, 0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1})} \leq Ct^{2\nu}(1 + |\ln t|), \quad k+l=2, \quad (2.30)$$

$$\|\rho^{-l}\partial_\rho^k Z_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho, 0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1})} \leq Ct^{2\nu}, \quad k+l \geq 3, l \leq (3-k)_+, \quad (2.31)$$

$$\|\partial_\rho Z_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1})} + \|\rho^{-1} Z_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1})} \leq Ct^{2\nu}(1 + |\ln t|), \quad (2.32)$$

$$\|\rho^{-l}\partial_\rho^k Z_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1})} \leq Ct^{2\nu}, \quad 2 \leq l+k, l \leq (3-k)_+. \quad (2.33)$$

(ii) *The error $\mathcal{R}_{in}^{(N)}$ admits the estimates*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho^{-l}\partial_\rho^k \mathcal{R}_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho, 0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1})} &\leq t^{N\varepsilon_1}, \quad 0 \leq l+k \leq 3, \\ \|\rho^{-l}\partial_\rho^k \partial_t \mathcal{R}_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho, 0 \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1})} &\leq t^{N\varepsilon_1}, \quad 0 \leq k+l \leq 1, \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

provided $N > \varepsilon_1^{-1}$.

2.3 Self-similar region $rt^{-1/2} \lesssim 1$

We next consider the self-similar region $\frac{1}{10}t^{\varepsilon_1} \leq rt^{-1/2} \leq 10t^{-\varepsilon_2}$, where $0 < \varepsilon_2 < 1/2$ to be fixed later. In this region we expect the solution to be close to

k . In this regime it will be convenient to use the stereographic representation of (2.2):

$$(v_1, v_2, v_3) = v \rightarrow w = \frac{v_1 + iv_2}{1 + v_3} \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

Equation (2.2) is equivalent to

$$iw_t = -\Delta w + r^{-2}w + G(w, \bar{w}, w_r), \quad G(w, \bar{w}, w_r) = \frac{2\bar{w}}{1 + |w|^2}(w_r^2 - r^{-2}w^2). \quad (2.35)$$

Slightly more generally, if $w(r, t)$ is a solution of

$$iw_t = -\Delta w + r^{-2}w + G(w, \bar{w}, w_r) + A, \quad (2.36)$$

then $v = (\frac{2\operatorname{re} w}{1+|w|^2}, \frac{2\operatorname{im} w}{1+|w|^2}, \frac{1-|w|^2}{1+|w|^2}) \in S^2$ solves

$$v_t = v \times (\Delta v + \frac{R^2}{r^2}v) + \mathcal{A}, \quad (2.37)$$

with $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_3)$ given by

$$\mathcal{A}_1 + i\mathcal{A}_2 = -2i \frac{A + w^2 \bar{A}}{(1 + |w|^2)^2}, \quad \mathcal{A}_3 = \frac{4\operatorname{im}(w \bar{A})}{(1 + |w|^2)^2}.$$

Consider (2.35). Write w as

$$w(r, t) = e^{i\alpha(t)} W(y, t), \quad y = rt^{-1/2}.$$

Then (2.35) becomes

$$itW_t - \alpha_0 W = \mathcal{L}W + G(W, \bar{W}, W_y), \quad (2.38)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L} = -\Delta + y^{-2} + i\frac{1}{2}y\partial_y.$$

Note that as $y \rightarrow 0$, (2.23) gives the following expansion:

$$W(y, t) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} \sum_{i \geq -j+l/2} \alpha(j, i, l) t^{\nu(2j+1)} (\ln y - \nu \ln t)^l y^{2i-1}, \quad (2.39)$$

where the coefficients $\alpha(j, i, l)$ can be expressed explicitly in terms of $c_{j', l'}^{k, i'}$, $1 \leq k \leq j + i$, $j' \leq i$, $0 \leq l' \leq l$. This suggests the following ansatz for W :

$$W(y, t) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} t^{\nu(2j+1)} (\ln y - \nu \ln t)^l W_{j,l}(y). \quad (2.40)$$

Substituting (2.40) into (2.38) one gets the following recurrent system for $W_{j,l}$, $0 \leq l \leq 2j + 1$, $j \geq 0$:

$$\begin{cases} (\mathcal{L} - \mu_0)W_{0,1} = 0, \\ (\mathcal{L} - \mu_0)W_{0,0} = -i(1/2 + \nu)W_{0,1} + 2y^{-1}\partial_y W_{0,1}, \end{cases} \quad (2.41)$$

$$\begin{cases} (\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)W_{j,2j+1} = \mathcal{G}_{j,2j+1}, \\ (\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)W_{j,2j} = \mathcal{G}_{j,2j} - i(2j+1)(1/2 + \nu)W_{j,2j+1} + 2(2j+1)y^{-1}\partial_y W_{j,2j+1}, \\ (\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)W_{j,l} = \mathcal{G}_{j,l} - i(l+1)(1/2 + \nu)W_{j,l+1} \\ + 2(l+1)y^{-1}\partial_y W_{j,l+1} + (l+1)(l+2)y^{-2}W_{j,l+2}, \quad 0 \leq l \leq 2j-1. \end{cases} \quad (2.42)$$

Here $\mu_j = -\alpha_0 + i\nu(2j+1)$, and $\mathcal{G}_{j,l}$ is the contribution of the nonlinear term $G(W, \bar{W}, W_r)$, that depends only on $W_{i,n}$, $i \leq j-1$:

$$G(W, \bar{W}, W_r) = - \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} t^{(2j+1)\nu} (\ln y - \nu \ln t)^l \mathcal{G}_{j,l}(y),$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{j,l}(y) = \mathcal{G}_{j,l}(y; W_{i,n}, 0 \leq n \leq 2i+1, 0 \leq i \leq j-1).$$

One has

Lemma 2.4. *Given coefficients a_j, b_j , $j \geq 0$, there exists a unique solution of (2.41), (2.42), $W_{j,l} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$, $0 \leq m \leq 2j+1$, $j \geq 0$, such that as $y \rightarrow 0$, $W_{j,l}$ has the following asymptotic expansion*

$$W_{j,l}(y) = \sum_{i \geq -j+l/2} d_i^{j,l} y^{2i-1}, \quad (2.43)$$

with

$$d_1^{j,1} = a_j, \quad d_1^{j,0} = b_j. \quad (2.44)$$

The asymptotic expansion (2.43) can be differentiated any number of times with respect to y .

Proof. First note that equation $(\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)f = 0$ has a basis of solutions $\{e_j^1, e_j^2\}$ such that

- (i) e_j^1 is a C^∞ odd function, $e_j^1(y) = y + O(y^3)$ as $y \rightarrow 0$;
- (ii) $e_j^2 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$ and admits the representation:

$$e_j^2(y) = y^{-1} + \kappa_j e_j^1(y) \ln y + \tilde{e}_j^2(y), \quad \kappa_j = -\frac{i}{4} - \frac{\mu_j}{2},$$

where $\tilde{e}_j^2$ is a C^∞ odd function, $\tilde{e}_j^2(y) = O(y^3)$ as $y \rightarrow 0$.

Consider (2.41). From $(\mathcal{L} - \mu_0)W_{0,1} = 0$ and (2.43), (2.44), we get

$$W_{0,1} = a_0 e_0^1.$$

Consider the equation for $W_{0,0}$:

$$(\mathcal{L} - \mu_0)W_{0,0} = -i(1/2 + \nu)W_{0,1} + 2y^{-1}\partial_y W_{0,1}.$$

The right hand side has the form: $2a_0 y^{-1} +$ a C^∞ odd function. Therefore, the equation has a unique solution $W_{0,0}^0$ of the form

$$W_{0,0}^0(y) = d_0 y^{-1} + \tilde{W}_{0,0}^0(y),$$

where $d_0 = \frac{a_0}{k_j}$ and $\tilde{W}_{0,0}^0$ is a C^∞ odd function, $\tilde{W}_{0,0}^0(y) = O(y^3)$ as $y \rightarrow 0$. Together with (2.43), (2.44), this gives:

$$W_{0,0} = W_{0,0}^0 + b_0 e_0^1.$$

Consider the case $j \geq 1$. We have

$$(\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)W_{j,l} = \mathcal{F}_{j,l}, \quad 0 \leq l \leq 2j+1, \quad (2.45)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{j,2j+1} &= \mathcal{G}_{j,2j+1}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{j,2j} &= \mathcal{G}_{j,2j} - i(2j+1)(1/2 + \nu)W_{j,2j+1} + 2(2j+1)y^{-1}\partial_y W_{j,2j+1}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{j,l} &= \mathcal{G}_{j,l} - i(l+1)(1/2 + \nu)W_{j,l+1} \\ &\quad + 2(l+1)y^{-1}\partial_y W_{j,l+1} + (l+1)(l+2)y^{-2}W_{j,l+2}, \quad 0 \leq l \leq 2j-1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.46)$$

The resolution of (2.45) is based on the following obvious ODE lemma:

Lemma 2.5. *Let F be a $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$ function of the form*

$$F(y) = \sum_{j=k}^0 F_j y^{2j-1} + \tilde{F}(y),$$

where $\tilde{F}$ is a C^∞ odd function and $k \leq -1$. Then there exists a unique constant A such that the equation $(\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)u = F + Ay^{-3}$ has a solution $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$ with the following behavior as $y \rightarrow 0$:

$$u(y) = \sum_{j \geq k+1} u_j y^{2j-1}, \quad u_1 = 0.$$

More precisely, we proceed as follows. Assume that $W_{i,n}$, $0 \leq n \leq 2i+1$, $i \leq j-1$ has the prescribed behavior (2.43), (2.44). Then it is not difficult to check that $\mathcal{G}_{j,l}$ admit the following expansion as $y \rightarrow 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{j,2j+1}(y) &= \sum_{i \geq 1} g_{j,2j+1}^i y^{2i-1}, \\ \mathcal{G}_{j,2j}(y) &= \sum_{i \geq 0} g_{j,2j}^i y^{2i-1}, \\ \mathcal{G}_{j,l}(y) &= \sum_{i \geq -j+l/2-1} g_{j,l}^i y^{2i-1}, \quad l \leq 2j-1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.47}$$

Consider $W_{j,2j+1}$. From $(\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)W_{j,2j+1} = \mathcal{G}_{j,2j+1}$ we get

$$W_{j,2j+1} = W_{j,2j+1}^0 + c_0 e_j^1, \tag{2.48}$$

where $W_{j,2j+1}^0$ is a unique C^∞ odd solution of $(\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)f = \mathcal{G}_{j,2j+1}$ that satisfies $W_{j,2j+1}^0(y) = O(y^3)$ as $y \rightarrow 0$. The constant c_0 remains undetermined at this stage.

Consider $\mathcal{F}_{j,2j}$. It has the form: $(g_{j,2j}^0 + 2(2j+1)c_0)y^{-1} +$ a C^∞ odd function. Therefore, for $W_{j,2j}$ we obtain

$$W_{j,2j} = W_{j,2j}^0 + c_1 e_j^1, \tag{2.49}$$

where $W_{j,2j}^0$ is a unique solution of $(\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)f = \mathcal{F}_{j,2j}$, that satisfies as $y \rightarrow 0$,

$$W_{j,2j}^0 = d_1 y^{-1} + O(y^3), \quad d_1 = \frac{g_{j,2j}^0 + 2(2j+1)c_0}{2k_j}. \tag{2.50}$$

Similarly to c_0 , the constant c_1 is arbitrary here.

Consider $\mathcal{F}_{j,2j-1}$. It follows from (2.46), (2.47), (2.48), (2.49), (2.50) that

$$\mathcal{F}_{j,2j-1} = (g_{j,2j-1}^{-1} - 4jd_1)y^{-3} + \text{const } y^{-1} + \text{an } C^\infty \text{ odd function.}$$

The equation $(\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)W_{j,2j-1} = \mathcal{F}_{j,2j-1}$ has a solution of form (2.43) iff

$$g_{j,2j-1}^{-1} - 4jd_1 = 0,$$

which gives

$$c_0 = \frac{k_j g_{j,2j-1}^{-1} - 1 - 2j g_{j,2j}^0}{4j(2j+1)}.$$

With this choice of c_0 one gets

$$W_{j,2j-1} = W_{j,2j-1}^0 + c_2 e_j^1,$$

where $W_{j,2j-1}^0$ is a unique solution of $(\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)f = \mathcal{F}_{j,2j-1}$, that satisfies as $y \rightarrow 0$,

$$W_{j,2j-1}^0 = \text{const } y^{-1} + O(y^3).$$

Continuing the procedure one successively finds $W_{j,2j-2}, \dots, W_{j,0}$ in the form $W_{j,2j+1-k} = W_{j,2j+1-k}^0 + c_k e_j^1$, $k \leq 2j+1$, where $W_{j,2j+1-k}^0$ is an unique solution of $(\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)f = \mathcal{F}_{j,2j+1-k}$, that as $y \rightarrow 0$ has an asymptotic expansion of the form (2.43) with vanishing coefficients $d_1^{j,l}$. The constant c_k , $k \leq 2j-1$, is determined uniquely by the solvability condition of the equation for $W_{j,2j-k-1}$ (see lemma 2.5). Finally, c_{2j+1} , c_{2j+2} are given by (2.44):

$$c_{2j+1} = a_j, \quad c_{2j+2} = b_j. \quad \square$$

We denote by $W_{j,l}^{ss}(y)$, $0 \leq l \leq 2j+1$, $j \geq 0$, the solution of (2.41), (2.42) given by lemma 2.4 with $a_j = \alpha(j, 1, 1)$, $b_j = \alpha(j, 1, 0)$, see (2.39). By uniqueness we have as $y \rightarrow 0$,

$$W_{j,l}^{ss}(y) = \sum_{i \geq -j+l/2} \alpha(j, i, l) y^{2i-1}, \quad (2.51)$$

We next study the behavior of $W_{j,l}^{ss}$, $0 \leq l \leq 2j+1$, $j \geq 0$, at infinity. One has

Lemma 2.6. *Given coefficients $a_{j,l}$, $b_{j,l}$, $0 \leq l \leq 2j+1$, $j \geq 0$, there exists a unique solution of (2.41), (2.42) of the following form.*

$$W_{0,l} = W_{0,l}^0 + W_{0,l}^1, \quad l = 0, 1, \quad (2.52)$$

$$W_{j,l} = W_{j,l}^0 + W_{j,l}^1 + W_{j,l}^2, \quad 0 \leq l \leq 2j+1, \quad j \geq 1, \quad (2.53)$$

where $(W_{j,l}^i)_{\substack{0 \leq l \leq 2j+1 \\ j \geq 1}}$, $i = 0, 1$, are two solutions of (2.41), (2.42) that, as $y \rightarrow \infty$, have the following asymptotic expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} (\ln y - \nu \ln t)^l W_{j,l}^i(y) &= \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} (\ln y + (-1)^i \ln t/2)^l \hat{W}_{j,l}^i(y), \quad i = 0, 1, \\ \hat{W}_{j,l}^0(y) &= y^{2i\alpha_0 + 2\nu(2j+1)} \sum_{k \geq 0} \hat{w}_k^{j,l,0} y^{-2k}, \\ \hat{W}_{j,l}^1(y) &= e^{iy^2/4} y^{-2i\alpha_0 - 2 - 2\nu(2j+1)} \sum_{k \geq 0} \hat{w}_k^{j,l,-1} y^{-2k}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.54)$$

with

$$\hat{w}_0^{j,l,0} = a_{j,l}, \quad \hat{w}_0^{j,l,-1} = b_{j,l}. \quad (2.55)$$

Finally, the interaction part $W_{j,l}^2$ can be written as

$$W_{j,l}^2(y) = \sum_{-j-1 \leq m \leq j} e^{-imy^2/4} y^{2i\alpha_0(2m+1)} W_{j,l,m}(y), \quad (2.56)$$

where $W_{j,l,m}$ have the following asymptotic expansion as $y \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{j,l,m}(y) &= \sum_{k \geq m+2} \sum_{\substack{m-j \leq i \leq j-m \\ j-m-i \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} w_{k,i,s}^{j,l,m} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \quad m \geq 1, \\ W_{j,l,m}(y) &= \sum_{k \geq -m} \sum_{\substack{-j-m-2 \leq i \leq j+m \\ j-m-i \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} w_{k,i,s}^{j,l,m} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \quad m \leq -2, \\ W_{j,l,0}(y) &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{-j \leq i \leq j-2 \\ j-i \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} w_{k,i,s}^{j,l,0} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \\ W_{j,l,-1}(y) &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{-j+1 \leq i \leq j-1 \\ j-i+1 \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} w_{k,i,s}^{j,l,-1} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s. \end{aligned} \quad (2.57)$$

The asymptotic expansion (2.54), (2.57) can be differentiated any number of times with respect to y .

Any solution of (2.41), (2.42) has form (2.52), (2.53), (2.54), (2.56), (2.57).

Proof. First note that equation $(\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)f = 0$ has a basis of solutions $\{f_j^1, f_j^2\}$ with the following behavior at infinity:

$$f_j^1(y) = y^{2i\alpha_0 + 2\nu(2j+1)} \sum_{k \geq 0} f_{j,1}^k y^{-2k}, \quad f_j^2(y) = e^{iy^2/4} y^{-2i\alpha_0 - 2\nu(2j+1) - 2} \sum_{k \geq 0} f_{j,2}^k y^{-2k},$$

$f_{j,1}^0 = f_{j,2}^0 = 1$. As a consequence, the homogeneous system

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)g_{2j+1} &= 0, \\ (\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)g_{2j} &= -i(2j+1)(1/2 + \nu)g_{2j+1} + 2(2j+1)y^{-1}\partial_y g_{2j+1}, \\ (\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)g_l &= -i(l+1)(1/2 + \nu)g_{l+1} \\ &\quad + 2(l+1)y^{-1}\partial_y g_{l+1} + (l+1)(l+2)y^{-2}g_{l+2}, \quad 0 \leq l \leq 2j-1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.58)$$

has a basis of solutions $\{\mathbf{g}_j^{i,m}\}_{m=0,\dots,2j+1}^{i=1,2}$,

$$\mathbf{g}_j^{i,m} = (g_{j,0}^{i,m}, \dots, g_{j,2j+1}^{i,m}), \quad 0 \leq m \leq 2j+1, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

defined by

$$\sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} (\ln y - \nu \ln t)^l g_{j,l}^{i,m}(y) = \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} (\ln y + (-1)^{i-1} \ln t/2)^l \xi_{j,l}^{i,m}(y), \quad (2.59)$$

where $(\xi_{j,l}^{i,m})_{l=0,\dots,2j+1}$ is the unique solution of

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)\xi_{2j+1} &= 0, \\ (\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)\xi_{2j} &= -i(2j+1)(i-1)\xi_{2j+1} + 2(2j+1)y^{-1}\partial_y \xi_{2j+1}, \\ (\mathcal{L} - \mu_j)\xi_l &= -i(l+1)(i-1)\xi_{l+1} + 2(l+1)y^{-1}\partial_y \xi_{l+1} \\ &\quad + (l+1)(l+2)y^{-2}\xi_{l+2}, \quad 0 \leq l \leq 2j-1, \end{aligned} \quad (2.60)$$

verifying

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{j,l}^{i,m}(y) &= 0, \quad l > 2j+1-m, \\ \xi_{j,2j+1-m}^{i,m}(y) &= f_j^i(y), \\ \xi_{j,l}^{1,m}(y) &= y^{2i\alpha_0 + 2\nu(2j+1)} \sum_{k \geq 2j+1-l-m} \xi_{l,k}^1 y^{-2k}, \quad y \rightarrow +\infty, \\ \xi_{j,l}^{2,m}(y) &= e^{iy^2/4} y^{-2i\alpha_0 - 2\nu(2j+1) - 2} \sum_{k \geq 2j+1-l-m} \xi_{l,k}^2 y^{-2k} \quad y \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (2.61)$$

Consider $W_{0,l}$, $l = 0, 1$. We have

$$(\mathcal{L} - \mu_0)W_{0,1} = 0,$$

$$(\mathcal{L} - \mu_0)W_{0,0} = -i(1/2 + \nu)W_{0,1} + 2y^{-1}\partial_y W_{0,1},$$

which gives

$$W_{0,l}(y) = \sum_{\substack{i=1,2, \\ m=0,1}} A_{i,m} g_{0,l}^{i,m}(y), \quad l = 0, 1,$$

with some constants $A_{i,m}$, $i = 1, 2$, $m = 0, 1$. It follows from (2.59), (2.61) that $W_{0,l}$, $l = 0, 1$ have the form (2.52), (2.54) with $\hat{w}_0^{j,l,0} = A_{1,1-l}$, $\hat{w}_0^{j,l,-1} = A_{2,1-l}$, $l = 0, 1$, which together with (2.55) gives $A_{1,m} = a_{0,1-m}$, $A_{2,m} = b_{0,1-m}$, $m = 0, 1$.

We next consider $j \geq 1$. Assume that $W_{i,n}$, $0 \leq n \leq 2i + 1$, $i \leq j - 1$ has the prescribed behavior (2.53), (2.54), (2.56), (2.57). Then it is not difficult to check that $\mathcal{G}_{j,l}$ has the form

$$\mathcal{G}_{j,l}(y) = \sum_{-j-1 \leq m \leq j} e^{-imy^2/4} y^{2i\alpha_0(2m+1)} \mathcal{G}_{j,l}^m(y), \quad (2.62)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{j,l}^m$, $m = 0, -1$, are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{j,l}^m(y) &= \mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{m,0}(y) + \mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{m,1}(y), \quad m = 0, -1, \\ \mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{0,0}(y) &= \mathcal{G}_{j,l}(y; W_{i,n}^0, 0 \leq n \leq 2i + 1, 0 \leq i \leq j - 1), \\ e^{iy^2/4} \mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{-1,0}(y) &= \mathcal{G}_{j,l}(y; W_{i,n}^1, 0 \leq n \leq 2i + 1, 0 \leq i \leq j - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (2.63)$$

and admit the following asymptotic expansions and as $y \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{0,0}(y) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} T_{k,j,s}^{j,l,0} y^{2\nu(2j+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \quad (2.64)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{0,1}(y) = \sum_{k \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{-j \leq i \leq j-2 \\ j-i \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} T_{k,i,s}^{j,l,0} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s,$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{-1,0}(y) = \sum_{k \geq 2} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} T_{k,-j-1,s}^{j,l,-1} y^{-2\nu(2j+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \quad (2.65)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{-1,1}(y) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{-j+1 \leq i \leq j-1 \\ j-i+1 \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} T_{k,i,s}^{j,l,-1} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s.$$

Finally, $\mathcal{G}_{j,l}^m$, $m \neq 0, -1$, have the following behavior as $y \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_{j,l}^m(y) &= \sum_{k \geq m+1} \sum_{\substack{m-j \leq i \leq j-m \\ j-m-i \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} T_{k,i,s}^{j,l,m} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \quad m \geq 1, \\ \mathcal{G}_{j,l}^m(y) &= \sum_{k \geq |m|-1} \sum_{\substack{-j-m-2 \leq i \leq j+m \\ j+m-i \in \mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} T_{k,i,s}^{j,l,m} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \quad m \leq -2,\end{aligned}\tag{2.66}$$

Therefore, integrating (2.42), one gets

$$\begin{aligned}W_{j,l} &= \tilde{W}_{j,l} + \sum_{\substack{i=1,2 \\ m=0,\dots,2j+1}} A_{i,m} \mathbf{g}_{j,l}^{i,m}, \\ \tilde{W}_{j,l}(y) &= \sum_{-j-1 \leq m \leq j} e^{-imy^2/4} y^{2i\alpha_0(2m+1)} \tilde{W}_{j,l}^m(y),\end{aligned}\tag{2.67}$$

where $e^{-imy^2/4} y^{2i\alpha_0(2m+1)} \tilde{W}_{j,l}^m$ is a unique solution of (2.42) with $\mathcal{G}_{j,l}$ replaced by $e^{-imy^2/4} y^{2i\alpha_0(2m+1)} \mathcal{G}_{j,l}^m(y)$, that has the following behavior as $y \rightarrow +\infty$:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{W}_{j,l}^m(y) &= \sum_{k \geq m+2} \sum_{\substack{m-j \leq i \leq j-m \\ j-m-i \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} \tilde{w}_{k,i,s}^{j,l,m} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \quad m \geq 1, \\ \tilde{W}_{j,l}^m(y) &= \sum_{k \geq -m} \sum_{\substack{-j-m-2 \leq i \leq j+m \\ j-m-i \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} \tilde{w}_{k,i,s}^{j,l,m} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \quad m \leq -2.\end{aligned}\tag{2.68}$$

Finally for $m = 0, -1$ one has:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{W}_{j,l}^0(y) &= \tilde{W}_{j,l}^{0,0}(y) + \tilde{W}_{j,l}^{0,1}(y), \\ \tilde{W}_{j,l}^{-1}(y) &= \tilde{W}_{j,l}^{-1,0}(y) + \tilde{W}_{j,l}^{-1,1}(y),\end{aligned}\tag{2.69}$$

where $\tilde{W}_{j,l}^{0,i}$ and $e^{iy^2/4} y^{-2i\alpha_0} \tilde{W}_{j,l}^{-1,i}$ are solutions of (2.42) with $\mathcal{G}_{j,l}$ replaced by $\mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{0,i}$ and $y^{-2i\alpha_0} e^{iy^2/4} \mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{-1,i}$ respectively, with the following asymptotics as

$y \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{W}_{j,l}^{0,0}(y) &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} \tilde{w}_{k,j,s}^{j,l,0} y^{2\nu(2j+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \\
\tilde{W}_{j,l}^{0,1}(y) &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{-j \leq i \leq j-2 \\ j-i \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} \tilde{w}_{k,i,s}^{j,l,0} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \\
\tilde{W}_{j,l}^{-1,0}(y) &= \sum_{k \geq 2} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} \tilde{w}_{k,-j-1,s}^{j,l,-1} y^{-2\nu(2j+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s, \\
\tilde{W}_{j,l}^{-1,1}(y) &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{-j+1 \leq i \leq j-1 \\ j-i \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^{2j+1-l} \tilde{w}_{k,i,s}^{j,l,-1} y^{2\nu(2i+1)-2k} (\ln y)^s.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.70}$$

Clearly, $W_{j,l}^0 = \tilde{W}_{j,l}^{0,0} + \sum_{m=0}^{2j+1} A_{1,m} \mathbf{g}_{j,l}^{1,m}$, and $W_{j,l}^1 = e^{-imy^2/4} \tilde{W}_{j,l}^{-1,0} + \sum_{m=0}^{2j+1} A_{2,m} \mathbf{g}_{j,l}^{2,m}$ are solutions of (2.42) with $\mathcal{G}_{j,l}$ replaced by $\mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{0,0} = \mathcal{G}_{j,l}(W_{i,n}^0, i \leq j-1)$ and $e^{iy^2/4} \mathcal{G}_{j,l}^{-1,0} = \mathcal{G}_{j,l}(W_{i,n}^1, i \leq j-1)$ respectively. As a consequence, $W_{j,l}^i$, $i = 0, 1$, $0 \leq l \leq 2j+1$, have the form (2.54) with $\hat{w}_0^{j,l,i} = A_{2j+1-l}^{1-i}$, $i = 0, -1$, $l = 0, \dots, 2j+1$, which together with (2.55) gives $A_{1,m} = a_{j,2j+1-m}$, $A_{2,m} = b_{j,2j+1-m}$, $m = 0, \dots, 2j+1$. $\square$

Let $W_{in}^{(N)}(y, t)$ be the stereographic representation of $V_{in}^{(N)}(t^{-\nu}y, t) = (V_{in,1}^{(N)}(t^{-\nu}y, t), V_{in,2}^{(N)}(t^{-\nu}y, t), V_{in,3}^{(N)}(t^{-\nu}y, t))$:

$$W_{in}^{(N)}(y, t) = \frac{V_{in,1}^{(N)}(t^{-\nu}y, t) + iV_{in,2}^{(N)}(t^{-\nu}y, t)}{1 + V_{in,3}^{(N)}(t^{-\nu}y, t)}.$$

For $N \geq 2$ define

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{ss}^{(N)}(y, t) &= \sum_{j=0}^N \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} t^{\nu(2j+1)} (\ln \rho)^l W_{j,l}^{ss}(y), \\
A_{ss}^{(N)} &= -it \partial_t W_{ss}^{(N)} + \alpha_0 W_{ss}^{(N)} + \mathcal{L} W_{ss}^{(N)} + G(W_{ss}^{(N)}, \bar{W}_{ss}^{(N)}, \partial_y W_{ss}^{(N)}), \\
V_{ss}^{(N)}(\rho, t) &= \left(\frac{2 \operatorname{re} W_{ss}^{(N)}}{1 + |W_{ss}^{(N)}|^2}, \frac{2 \operatorname{im} W_{ss}^{(N)}}{1 + |W_{ss}^{(N)}|^2}, \frac{1 - |W_{ss}^{(N)}|^2}{1 + |W_{ss}^{(N)}|^2} \right), \quad \rho = t^{-\nu}y, \\
Z_{ss}^{(N)}(\rho, t) &= V_{ss}^{(N)}(\rho, t) - Q(\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

Fix $\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\nu}{2}$. Then, as a direct consequence of the previous analysis, we obtain the following result.

Lemma 2.7. *For $0 < t \leq T(N)$ the following holds.*

(i) *For any k, l , and $\frac{1}{10}t^{\varepsilon_1} \leq y \leq 10t^{\varepsilon_1}$, one has*

$$|y^{-l} \partial_y^k \partial_t^i (W_{ss}^{(N)} - W_{in}^{(N)})| \leq C_{k,l,i} t^{\nu(N+1-\frac{l+k}{2})-i}, \quad i = 0, 1. \quad (2.71)$$

(ii) *The profile $Z_{ss}^{(N)}$ verifies*

$$\|\partial_\rho Z_{ss}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho, \frac{1}{10}t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1} \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu-\varepsilon_2})} \leq Ct^\eta, \quad (2.72)$$

$$\|\rho^{-1} Z_{ss}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho, \frac{1}{10}t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1} \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu-\varepsilon_2})} \leq Ct^\eta, \quad (2.73)$$

$$\|Z_{ss}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{10}t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1} \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu-\varepsilon_2})} \leq Ct^\eta, \quad (2.74)$$

$$\|\rho \partial_\rho Z_{ss}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{10}t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1} \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu-\varepsilon_2})} \leq Ct^\eta, \quad (2.75)$$

$$\|\rho^{-l} \partial_\rho^k Z_{ss}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho, \frac{1}{10}t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1} \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu-\varepsilon_2})} \leq Ct^{\nu+\frac{1}{2}+\eta}, \quad k+l=2, \quad (2.76)$$

$$\|\rho^{-l} \partial_\rho^k Z_{in}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(\rho d\rho, \frac{1}{10}t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1} \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu-\varepsilon_2})} \leq Ct^{2\nu}, \quad k+l \geq 3, \quad (2.77)$$

$$\|\rho^{-l} \partial_\rho^k Z_{ss}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{10}t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1} \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu-\varepsilon_2})} \leq Ct^{\nu+\eta}, \quad k+l=1, \quad (2.78)$$

$$\|\rho^{-l} \partial_\rho^k Z_{ss}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(\frac{1}{10}t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1} \leq \rho \leq 10t^{-\nu-\varepsilon_2})} \leq Ct^{2\nu}, \quad 2 \leq l+k. \quad (2.79)$$

Here and below η stands for small positive constants depending on ν and ε_2 , that may change from line to line.

(iii) *The error $A_{ss}^{(N)}$ admits the estimate*

$$\|y^{-l} \partial_y^k \partial_t^i A_{ss}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(y dy, \frac{1}{10}t^{\varepsilon_1} \leq y \leq 10t^{-\varepsilon_2})} \leq t^{\nu N(1-2\varepsilon_2)-i}, \quad 0 \leq l+k \leq 4, \quad i = 0, 1. \quad (2.80)$$

2.4 Remote region $r \sim 1$

We next consider the remote region $t^{-\varepsilon_2} \leq rt^{-1/2}$. Consider the formal solution $\sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} t^{\nu(2j+1)} (\ln y - \nu \ln t)^l W_{j,l}^{ss}(y)$ constructed in the previous subsection. By lemma 2.6, it has form (2.52), (2.53), (2.54), (2.56), (2.57), with some coefficients $\hat{w}_k^{j,l,i}, w_{k,i,s}^{j,l,m}$. Note that in the limit $y \rightarrow \infty, r \rightarrow 0$, the main order terms of the expansion $\sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} t^{\nu(2j+1)+i\alpha_0} (\ln y - \nu \ln t)^l W_{j,l}^{ss}(t^{-1/2}r)$

are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} t^{\nu(2j+1)+i\alpha_0} (\ln y - \nu \ln t)^l W_{j,l}^{ss}(t^{-1/2}r) \sim \\
& \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{t^k}{r^{2k}} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} \hat{w}_k^{j,l,0} (\ln r)^l r^{2i\alpha_0+2\nu(2j+1)} \\
& + \frac{e^{\frac{ir^2}{4t}}}{t} \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{t^k}{r^{2k}} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} \hat{w}_k^{j,l,0} \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)^{-2i\alpha_0-2\nu(2j+1)-2} \left(\ln \left(\frac{r}{t}\right)\right)^l,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.81}$$

which means that in region $t^{-\varepsilon_2} \leq rt^{-1/2}$ we have to look for the solution of (2.35) as a perturbation of the time independent profile

$$\sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} \beta_0(j, l) (\ln r)^l r^{2\nu(2j+1)},$$

with $\beta_0(j, l) = \hat{w}_0^{j,l,0}$.

Let $\theta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $\theta(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1, & |\xi| \leq 1, \\ 0, & |\xi| \geq 2. \end{cases}$ For $N \geq 2$, and $\delta > 0$ we define

$$f_0(r) \equiv f_0^{(N)}(r) = \theta(\delta^{-1}r) \sum_{j=0}^N \sum_{l=0}^{2j+1} \beta_0(j, l) (\ln r)^l r^{2i\alpha_0+2\nu(2j+1)}.$$

Note that $e^{i\theta} f_0 \in H^{1+2\nu-}$ and

$$\|e^{i\theta} f_0\|_{\dot{H}^s} \leq C \delta^{1+2\nu-s}, \quad \forall 0 \leq s < 1 + 2\nu. \tag{2.82}$$

Write $w(r, t) = f_0(r) + \chi(r, t)$. Then χ solves

$$\begin{aligned}
i\chi_t &= -\Delta \chi + r^{-2} \chi + \mathcal{V}_0 \partial_r \chi + \mathcal{V}_1 \chi + \mathcal{V}_2 \bar{\chi} + \mathcal{N} + \mathcal{D}_0, \\
\mathcal{V}_0 &= \frac{4\bar{f}_0 \partial_r f_0}{1 + |f_0|^2}, \quad \mathcal{V}_1 = -\frac{2|f_0|^2(2 + |f_0|^2)}{r^2(1 + |f_0|^2)^2} - \frac{2\bar{f}_0^2(\partial_r f_0)^2}{(1 + |f_0|^2)^2}, \\
\mathcal{V}_2 &= \frac{2(r^2(\partial_r f_0)^2 - f_0^2)}{r^2(1 + |f_0|^2)^2}, \\
\mathcal{D}_0 &= (-\Delta + r^{-2})f_0 + G(f_0, \bar{f}_0, \partial_r f_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.83}$$

Finally, $\mathcal{N}$ contains the terms that are at least quadratic in χ and it has the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N} &= N_0(\chi, \bar{\chi}) + \chi_r N_1(\chi, \bar{\chi}) + \chi_r^2 N_2(\chi, \bar{\chi}), \\ N_0(\chi, \bar{\chi}) &= G(f_0 + \chi, \bar{f}_0 + \bar{\chi}, \partial_r f_0) - G(f_0, \bar{f}_0, \partial_r f_0) - \mathcal{V}_1 \chi - \mathcal{V}_2 \bar{\chi}, \\ N_1(\chi, \bar{\chi}) &= \frac{4\partial_r f_0(\bar{f}_0 + \bar{\chi})}{1 + |f_0 + \chi|^2} - \mathcal{V}_0, \\ N_2(\chi, \bar{\chi}) &= \frac{2(\bar{f}_0 + \bar{\chi})}{1 + |f_0 + \chi|^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.84}$$

Accordingly to (2.52), (2.53), (2.54), (2.56), (2.57), we look for χ as

$$\chi(r, t) = \sum_{\substack{q \geq 0 \\ k \geq 1}} t^{2\nu q + k} \sum_{\substack{-\min\{k, q\} \leq m \leq \min\{(k-2)_+, q\} \\ q-m \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^q e^{-im\Phi} (\ln r - \ln t)^s g_{k,q,m,s}(r),\tag{2.85}$$

where

$$\Phi = \frac{r^2}{4t} + 2\alpha_0 \ln t + \varphi(r),$$

with φ to be chosen later.

Substituting this ansatz to the expressions $-i\chi_t - \Delta\chi + r^{-2}\chi + \mathcal{V}_0\partial_r\chi + \mathcal{V}_1\chi + \mathcal{V}_2\bar{\chi}$, N , we get

$$\begin{aligned}& -i\chi_t + \Delta\chi - r^{-2}\chi + \mathcal{V}_0\partial_r\chi + \mathcal{V}_1\chi + \mathcal{V}_2\bar{\chi} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{q \geq 0 \\ k \geq 2}} t^{2\nu q + k - 2} \sum_{\substack{-\min\{k, q\} \leq m \leq \min\{(k-2)_+, q\} \\ q-m \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^q e^{-im\Phi} (\ln r - \ln t)^s \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin}, \\ N_0(\chi, \bar{\chi}) &= \sum_{\substack{q \geq 0 \\ k \geq 4}} t^{2\nu q + k - 2} \sum_{\substack{-\min\{k, q\} \leq m \leq \min\{(k-2)_+, q\} \\ q-m \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^q e^{-im\Phi} (\ln r - \ln t)^s \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,0}, \\ \chi_r N_1(\chi, \bar{\chi}) &= \sum_{\substack{q \geq 0 \\ k \geq 3}} t^{2\nu q + k - 2} \sum_{\substack{-\min\{k, q\} \leq m \leq \min\{(k-2)_+, q\} \\ q-m \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^q e^{-im\Phi} (\ln r - \ln t)^s \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,1}, \\ (\chi_r)^2 N_2(\chi, \bar{\chi}) &= \sum_{\substack{q \geq 0 \\ k \geq 2}} t^{2\nu q + k - 2} \sum_{\substack{-\min\{k, q\} \leq m \leq \min\{(k-2)_+, q\} \\ q-m \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{s=0}^q e^{-im\Phi} (\ln r - \ln t)^s \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,2},\end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin} = \frac{m(m+1)r^2}{4} g_{k,q,m,s} + \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin,1} + \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin,2},\tag{2.86}$$

with $\Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin,1}$ and $\Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin,2}$ depending respectively on $g_{k-1,q,m,s'}, s' = s, s+1$ and $g_{k-2,q,m,s'}, s' = s, s+1, s+2$ only:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin,1} = & -i(2\nu q + k - 1 - m - 2im\alpha_0)g_{k-1,q,m,s} + i(m+1)(s+1)g_{k-1,q,m,s+1} \\ & + imr(\partial_r - im\varphi'(r) - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}_0(r))g_{k-1,q,m,s}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.87)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin,2} = & -e^{im\varphi} \Delta(e^{-im\varphi} g_{k-2,q,m,s}) - \frac{2(s+1)}{r} e^{im\varphi} \partial_r(e^{-im\varphi} g_{k-2,q,m,s+1}) \\ & - \frac{(s+1)(s+2)}{r^2} g_{k-2,q,m,s+2} + \mathcal{V}_0 e^{im\varphi} \partial_r(e^{-im\varphi} g_{k-2,q,m,s}) \\ & + (r^{-2} + \mathcal{V}_1)g_{k-2,q,m,s} + \mathcal{V}_2 \bar{g}_{k-2,q,-m,s}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.88)$$

Here and below we use the convention $g_{k,q,m,s} = 0$ if $(k, q, m, s) \notin \Omega$, where

$$\Omega = \{k \geq 1, q \geq 0, 0 \leq s \leq q, q-m \in 2\mathbb{Z}, -\min\{k, q\} \leq m \leq \min\{k-1, q\}\}.$$

The nonlinear terms $\Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,i}$, $i = 0, 1$, depend only on $g_{k',q',m',s'}$ with $k' \leq k-2$. More precisely,

$$\Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,0} = \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,0}(r; g_{k',q',m',s'}, k' \leq k-3),$$

$$\Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,1} = \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,1}(r; g_{k',q',m',s'}, k' \leq k-2).$$

Finally, $\Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,2}$ has the following structure

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{2,q,m,s}^{nl,2} &= -\delta_{m,-2} \frac{r^2 \bar{f}_0}{2(1+|f_0|^2)} \sum_{\substack{q_1+q_2=q \\ s_1+s_2=s}} g_{1,q_1,-1,s_1} g_{1,q_2,-1,s_2}, \\ \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,2} &= \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,2,0} + \tilde{\Psi}_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,2}, \quad k \geq 3, \\ \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,2,0} &= \frac{(m+1)r^2 \bar{f}_0}{1+|f_0|^2} \sum_{\substack{q_1+q_2=q \\ s_1+s_2=s}} g_{1,q_1,-1,s_1} g_{k-1,q_2,m+1,s_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.89)$$

with $\tilde{\Psi}_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,2}$ depending on $g_{k',q',m',s'}$, $k' \leq k-2$ only:

$$\tilde{\Psi}_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,2} = (r; g_{k',q',m',s'}, k' \leq k-2).$$

Note that

$$\Psi_{k,q,-1,s}^{nl,2,0} = 0, \quad \forall k, q, s.$$

Equation (2.83) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \Psi_{2,0,0,0}^{lin} + \mathcal{D}_0 = 0, \\ \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin} + \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl} = 0, \quad (k, q, m, s) \in \Omega, \quad (k, q, m, s) \neq (2, 0, 0, 0), \end{cases} \quad (2.90)$$

Here $\Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl} = \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,0} + \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,1} + \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,2}$.

We view (2.90) as a recurrent system with respect to $k \geq 1$ of the form

$$\begin{cases} \Psi_{2,0,0,0}^{lin} + \mathcal{D}_0 = 0, \\ \Psi_{2,2j,0,s}^{lin} = 0, \quad (j, s) \neq (0, 0), \\ \Psi_{2,2j+1,1,s}^{lin} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.91)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \Psi_{k+1,q,m,s}^{lin} + \Psi_{k+1,q,m,s}^{nl} = 0, \quad m = 0, 1, \\ \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin} + \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl} = 0, \quad m \neq 0, 1 \end{cases}, \quad k \geq 2. \quad (2.92)$$

Consider (2.91). Choosing φ as

$$\varphi(r) = -i \int_0^r ds \frac{\bar{f}_0(s) \partial_s f_0(s) - f_0(s) \partial_s \bar{f}_0(s)}{1 + |f_0(s)|^2}, \quad (2.93)$$

we can rewrite (2.91) in the following form

$$\begin{cases} (4\nu j + 1)g_{1,2j,0,s} - (s + 1)g_{1,2j,0,s+1} = 0, \quad (j, s) \neq (0, 0), \\ g_{1,0,0,0} = -iD_0, \\ r \partial_r g_{1,2j+1,-1,s} + (2\nu(2j + 1) + 2 + 2i\alpha_0 - r(\ln(1 + |f_0|^2))')g_{1,2j+1,-1,s} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.94)$$

Accordingly to (2.81), we solve this system as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{1,2j,0,s} &= 0, \quad (j, s) \neq (0, 0), \\ g_{1,0,0,0} &= -iD_0, \\ g_{1,2j+1,-1,s} &= \beta_1(j, s)(1 + |f_0|^2)r^{-2i\alpha_0-2\nu(2j+1)-2}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2j + 1, \quad 0 \leq j \leq N, \\ g_{1,2j+1,-1,s} &= 0, \quad j > N, \end{aligned} \quad (2.95)$$

where $\beta_1(j, s) = \hat{w}_0^{j,l,-1}$.

Consider (2.92). We will solve it with the "zero boundary conditions" at zero. To formulate the result we need to introduce some notations. For

$m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote by $\mathcal{A}_m$ the space of continuous functions $a : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

- i) $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$, $\text{supp } a \subset \{r \leq 2\delta\}$;
- ii) for $0 \leq r < \delta$, a has an absolutely convergent expansion of the form

$$a(r) = \sum_{\substack{n \geq K(m) \\ n-m-1 \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} \sum_{l=0}^n \alpha_{n,l} (\ln r)^l r^{2\nu n},$$

where $K(m) = m + 1$ if $m \geq 0$, and $K(m) = |m| - 1$ if $m \leq -1$. For $k \geq 1$ we define $\mathcal{B}_k$ as the space of continuous functions $b : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that

- i) $b \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^*)$;
- ii) for $0 \leq r < \delta$, b has an absolutely convergent expansion of the form

$$b(r) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{2n} \beta_{n,l} r^{4\nu n} (\ln r)^l,$$

- iii) for $r \geq 2\delta$, b is a polynome of degree $k - 1$.

Finally, we set $\mathcal{B}_k^0 = \{b \in \mathcal{B}_k, b(0) = 0\}$.

Clearly, for any m, k , one has $r\partial_r \mathcal{A}_m \subset \mathcal{A}_m$, $r\partial_r \mathcal{B}_k \subset \mathcal{B}_k$, $\mathcal{B}_k \mathcal{A}_m \subset \mathcal{A}_m$. Note also that

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 &\in r^{2i\alpha_0} \mathcal{A}_0, \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{B}_1^0, \quad g_{1,0,0,0} \in r^{2i\alpha_0-2} \mathcal{A}_0, \\ g_{1,2j+1,-1,s} &\in r^{-2i\alpha_0-2\nu(2j+1)-2} \mathcal{B}_1, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2j+1. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, one checks easily that if for all $(k, q, m, s) \in \Omega$, $g_{k,q,m,s} \in r^{2i\alpha_0(1+2m)-2\nu q-2k} \mathcal{A}_m$ if $m \neq -1$ and $g_{k,q,-1,s} \in r^{-2i\alpha_0-2\nu q-2k} \mathcal{B}_k$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin,i}, \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,j}, \tilde{\Psi}_{k,q,m,s}^{nl,2} &\in r^{2i\alpha_0(1+2m)-2\nu q-2(k-1)} \mathcal{A}_m, \quad m \neq -1, \\ \Psi_{k,q,-1,s}^{lin,2}, \Psi_{k,q,-1,s}^{nl,j}, \tilde{\Psi}_{k,q,-1,s}^{nl,2} &\in r^{-2i\alpha_0-2\nu q-2(k-1)} \mathcal{B}_{k-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.96)$$

$i = 1, 2$, $j = 0, 1, 2$.

Consider (2.92). Using (2.86), (2.87), (2.88), (2.89), (2.93), one can rewrite it as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}m(m+1)r^2 g_{k,q,m,s} = B_{k,q,m,s}, & m \neq 0, -1, \\ r\partial_r g_{k,q,m,s} + \left(2\nu q + k + 1 + 2i\alpha_0 - \frac{r(\bar{f}_0 \partial_r f_0 + f_0 \partial_r \bar{f}_0)}{1+|f_0|^2}\right) g_{k,q,-1,s} = C_{k,q,-1,s}, \\ (2\nu q + k)g_{k,q,0,s} - (s+1)g_{k,q,0,s+1} = C_{k,q,0,s} + D_{k,q,s}, \end{cases} \quad (2.97)$$

where $B_{k,q,m,s}$, $C_{k,q,m,s}$ depend on $g_{k',q',m',s'}$, $k' \leq k-1$ only:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{k,q,m,s} &= B_{k,q,m,s}(r; g_{k',q',m',s'}, k' \leq k-1), \quad m \neq 0, -1, \\ C_{k,q,m,s} &= C_{k,q,m,s}(r; g_{k',q',m',s'}, k' \leq k-1), \quad m = 0, -1, \end{aligned}$$

and have the following form

$$\begin{aligned} B_{k,q,m,s} &= -\Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin,1} - \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{lin,2} - \Psi_{k,q,m,s}^{nl}, \quad m \neq 0, -1 \\ C_{k,q,m,s} &= -i\Psi_{k+1,q,m,s}^{lin,2} - i\tilde{\Psi}_{k+1,q,m,s}^{nl}, \quad m = 0, -1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.98)$$

Finally $D_{k,q,s}$ depend only on $g_{k,q,1,s}$ and is given by

$$D_{k,q,s} = -i\Psi_{k+1,q,0,s}^{nl,2,0} = -i\frac{r^2\bar{f}_0}{1+|f_0|^2} \sum_{\substack{q_1+q_2=q \\ s_1+s_2=s}} g_{1,q_1,-1,s_1} g_{k,q_2,1,s_2}. \quad (2.99)$$

Note that $D_{2,q,s} = 0$.

Remark 2.8. It is not difficult to check that if

$$\begin{aligned} g_{k,q,m,s} &= 0, \quad \forall q > (2N+1)(2k-2), \quad m \neq 0, 1, \\ g_{k,q,m,s} &= 0, \quad \forall q > (2N+1)(2k-1), \quad m = 0, 1, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} B_{k,q,m,s} &= 0, \quad \forall q > (2N+1)(2k-2), \quad m \neq 0, 1, \\ C_{k,q,m,s} &= 0, \quad \forall q > (2N+1)(2k-1), \quad m = 0, 1, \\ D_{k,q,s} &= 0, \quad \forall q > (2N+1)(2k-1). \end{aligned}$$

We are now in position to prove the following result.

Lemma 2.9. *There exists a unique solution $(g_{k,q,m,s})_{\substack{(k,q,m,s) \in \Omega \\ k \geq 2}}$ of (2.97) verifying*

$$\begin{aligned} g_{k,q,m,s} &\in r^{2i\alpha_0(2m+1)-2\nu q-2k} \mathcal{A}_m, \quad m \neq -1, \\ g_{k,q,-1,s} &\in r^{-2i\alpha_0-2\nu q-2k} \mathcal{B}_k. \end{aligned} \quad (2.100)$$

In addition, one has

$$\begin{aligned} g_{k,q,m,s} &= 0, \quad \forall q > (2N+1)(2k-2), \quad m \neq 0, 1, \\ g_{k,q,m,s} &= 0, \quad \forall q > (2N+1)(2k-1), \quad m = 0, 1, \end{aligned} \quad (2.101)$$

Proof. For $k = 2$ (2.97), (2.98), (2.89) give

$$\frac{1}{2}r^2 g_{2,2j,-2,s} = B_{2,2j,-2,s}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2j, \quad 1 \leq j, \quad (2.102)$$

$$\begin{aligned} r \partial_r g_{2,2j+1,-1,s} + \left(2\nu(2j+1) + 3 + 2i\alpha_0 - \frac{r(\bar{f}_0 \partial_r f_0 + f_0 \partial_r \bar{f}_0)}{1 + |f_0|^2} \right) g_{2,2j+1,-1,s} \\ = C_{2,2j+1,-1,s}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2j+1, \quad 0 \leq j, \end{aligned} \quad (2.103)$$

$$(4\nu j + 2)g_{2,2j,0,s} - (s+1)g_{2,2j,0,s+1} = C_{2,2j,0,s}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2j, \quad 0 \leq j, \quad (2.104)$$

Recall that $B_{2,q,m,s}$, $C_{2,q,m,s}$ depend only on $g_{1,q',m',s'}$ and therefore, are known by now. By (2.96), (2.98) and remark 2.8 they verify

$$\begin{aligned} B_{2,q,-2,s} &\in r^{-6i\alpha_0-2\nu q-2} \mathcal{A}_{-2}, \quad m \neq 0, -1 \\ C_{2,q,0,s} &\in r^{2i\alpha_0-2\nu q-4} \mathcal{A}_0, \quad C_{2,q,-1,s} \in r^{-2i\alpha_0-2\nu q-4} \mathcal{B}_1, \\ B_{2,q,-2,s} &= 0, \quad q > 2(2N+1), \\ C_{2,q,m,s} &= 0, \quad q > 3(2N+1), \quad m = 0, 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get from (2.102), (2.103),

$$\begin{aligned} g_{2,2j,-2,s} &= \frac{2}{r^2} B_{2,2j,-2,s} \in r^{-6i\alpha_0-4\nu j-4} \mathcal{A}_{-2}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2j, \quad 1 \leq j, \\ g_{2,2j,0,2j} &= \frac{1}{4j\nu+2} C_{2,2j,0,2j} \in r^{2i\alpha_0-4\nu j-4} \mathcal{A}_0, \quad 0 \leq j, \\ g_{2,2j,0,s} &= \frac{1}{4j\nu+2} C_{2,2j,0,s} + \frac{s+1}{4j\nu+2} g_{2,2j,0,s+1} \in r^{2i\alpha_0-4\nu j-4} \mathcal{A}_0, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2j, \\ g_{2,2j,-2,s} &= 0, \quad j > 2N+1, \\ g_{2,2j,0,s} &= 0, \quad j \geq 3N+2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.105)$$

Consider (2.104). Write

$$g_{2,2j+1,-1,s} = r^{-2i\alpha_0-3-2\nu(2j+1)} (1 + |f_0|^2) \hat{g}_{2,2j+1,-1,s}.$$

Then $\hat{g}_{2,2j+1,-1,s}$ solves

$$\partial_r \hat{g}_{2,2j+1,-1,s} = r^{-2} \hat{C}_{2,2j+1,-1,s}, \quad (2.106)$$

where

$$\hat{C}_{2,2j+1,-1,s} = r^{2i\alpha_0+4+2\nu(2j+1)} (1 + |f_0|^2)^{-1} C_{2,2j+1,-1,s}.$$

Since $C_{2,2j+1,-1,s} \in r^{-2i\alpha_0-2\nu(2j+1)-4}\mathcal{B}_1$, we have:

(i) for $0 \leq r < \delta$, $\hat{C}_{2,2j+1,-1,s}$ admits an absolutely convergent expansion of the form

$$\hat{C}_{2,2j+1,-1,s} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{2n} \beta_{n,l} r^{4\nu n} (\ln r)^l,$$

(ii) for $r \geq 2\delta$, $\hat{C}_{2,2j+1,-1,s}$ is a constant.

Clearly, there exists a unique solution $\hat{g}_{2,2j+1,-1,s}$ of (2.106) such that $\hat{g}_{2,2j+1,-1,s} \in r^{-1}\mathcal{B}_2$. It is given by

$$\hat{g}_{2,2j+1,-1,s}(r) = \int_0^r d\rho \rho^{-2} (\hat{C}_{2,2j+1,-1,s}(\rho) - \beta_{0,0}) - \beta_{0,0} r^{-1}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2j+1, \quad 0 \leq j.$$

Finally, since $C_{2,q,-1,s} = 0$ for $q > 3(2N+1)$, one has

$$g_{2,2j+1,-1,s} = 0, \quad j > 3N+1.$$

We next proceed by induction. Suppose we have solved (2.97) with $k = 2, \dots, l-1$, $l \geq 3$, and have found $(g_{k,q,m,s})_{\substack{(k,q,m,s) \in \Omega \\ 2 \leq k \leq l-1}}$ verifying (2.100) and (2.101). Consider $k = l$. From the first line in (2.97) we have:

$$\frac{1}{4} m(m+1) r^2 g_{l,q,m,s} = B_{l,q,m,s}, \quad m \neq 0, -1,$$

where $B_{l,q,m,s}$ are known by now and, by (2.96), (2.98) and remark 2.8, satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} B_{l,q,m,s} &\in r^{2i\alpha_0(2m+1)-2\nu q-2(l-1)} \mathcal{A}_m, \\ B_{l,q,m,s} &= 0, \quad q > 2(2N+1)(2l-2). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, one obtains for $m \neq 0, -1$:

$$\begin{aligned} g_{l,q,m,s} &= \frac{4}{m(m+1)r^2} B_{l,q,m,s} \in r^{2i\alpha_0(2m+1)-2\nu q-2l} \mathcal{A}_m, \\ g_{l,q,m,s} &= 0, \quad q > 2(2N+1)(2l-2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.107}$$

We next consider the equations for $g_{l,2j,0,s}$:

$$(4\nu j + l) g_{l,2j,0,s} - (s+1) g_{l,2j,0,s+1} = C_{l,2j,0,s} + D_{l,2j,s}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2j, \quad 0 \leq j. \tag{2.108}$$

The right hand side $C_{l,2j,0,s} + D_{l,2j,s}$ depends only on $g_{l,q_1,1,s_1}$ and g_{k,q_2,m_2,s_2} , $k \leq l-1$, and by (2.96), (2.98), (2.107) and remark 2.8, satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} C_{l,2j,0,s} + D_{l,2j,s} &\in r^{2i\alpha_0-4\nu j-2l} \mathcal{A}_0, \\ C_{l,2j,0,s} + D_{l,2j,s} &= 0, \quad j > (2N+1)(2l-1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the solution of (2.108) verifies

$$\begin{aligned} g_{l,2j,0,s} &\in r^{2i\alpha_0-4\nu j-2l} \mathcal{A}_0, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 2j, \quad 0 \leq j, \\ g_{l,2j,0,s} &= 0, \quad j > (2N+1)(2l-1). \end{aligned}$$

Finally for $g_{l,2j+1,-1,s}$, $0 \leq s \leq 2j+1$, $0 \leq j$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} r\partial_r g_{l,2j+1,m,s} + \left(2\nu(2j+1) + l + 1 + 2i\alpha_0 - \frac{r(\bar{f}_0\partial_r f_0 + f_0\partial_r \bar{f}_0)}{1 + |f_0|^2} \right) g_{l,2j+1,-1,s} \\ = C_{l,2j+1,-1,s}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.109)$$

with $C_{l,2j+1,-1,s} \in r^{-2i\alpha_0-2\nu(2j+1)-2l} \mathcal{B}_{l-1}$ such that

$$C_{l,2j+1,-1,s} = 0, \quad 2j+1 > (2N+1)(2l-1). \quad (2.110)$$

Equation (2.109) has a unique solution $g_{l,2j+1,-1,s}$ verifying $g_{l,2j+1,-1,s} \in r^{-2i\alpha_0-2\nu(2j+1)-2l} \mathcal{B}_l$, which is given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_{l,2j+1,-1,s} &= r^{-2i\alpha_0-2\nu(2j+1)-l-1} (1 + |f_0|^2) \hat{g}_{l,2j+1,-1,s}, \\ \hat{g}_{l,2j+1,-1,s} &= \int_0^r d\rho \rho^{-l} (\hat{C}_{l,2j+1,-1,s} - \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \frac{l-1}{4\nu}} \sum_{p=0}^{2n} \beta_{n,p} \rho^{4\nu n} (\ln \rho)^p) \\ &\quad - \int_r^\infty d\rho \rho^{-l} \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \frac{l-1}{4\nu}} \sum_{p=0}^{2n} \beta_{n,p} \rho^{4\nu n} (\ln \rho)^p, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_{l,2j+1,-1,s} &= r^{2i\alpha_0+2\nu(2j+1)+2l} (1 + |f_0|^2)^{-1} C_{l,2j+1,-1,s}, \\ \hat{C}_{l,2j+1,-1,s} &= \sum_{n=0}^\infty \sum_{p=0}^{2n} \beta_{n,p} r^n (\ln r)^p, \quad r < \delta. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.110),

$$g_{l,2j+1,-1,s} = 0, \quad 2j+1 > (2N+1)(2l-1). \quad \square$$

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} w_{rem}^{(N)}(r, t) &= f_0(r) + \sum_{(k,q,m,s) \in \Omega, k \leq N} t^{k+2\nu q} e^{-im\Phi} (\ln r - \ln t)^s g_{k,q,m,s}(r), \\ A_{rem}^{(N)} &= -i\partial_t w_{rem}^{(N)} - \Delta w_{rem}^{(N)} + r^{-2} w_{rem}^{(N)} + G(w_{rem}^{(N)}, \bar{w}_{rem}^{(N)}, \partial_r w_{rem}^{(N)}) \\ W_{rem}^{(N)}(y, t) &= e^{-i\alpha(t)} w_{rem}^{(N)}(rt^{-1/2}, t). \end{aligned}$$

As a direct consequence of the previous analysis we get:

Lemma 2.10. *There exists $T(N, \delta) > 0$ such that for $0 < t \leq T(N, \delta)$ the following holds.*

(i) *For any $0 \leq l, k \leq 4$, $i = 0, 1$ and $\frac{1}{10}t^{-\varepsilon_2} \leq y \leq 10t^{-\varepsilon_2}$, one has*

$$|y^{-l} \partial_y^k \partial_t^i (W_{ss}^{(N)} - W_{rem}^{(N)})| \leq t^{\nu(1-2\varepsilon_2)N} + t^{\varepsilon_2 N}, \quad (2.111)$$

provided N is sufficiently large (depending on ε_2).

(ii) *The profile $w_{rem}^{(N)}(r, t)$ verifies*

$$\|r^{-l} \partial_r^k (w_{rem}^{(N)}(t) - f_0)\|_{L^2(rdr, r \geq \frac{1}{10}t^{1/2-\varepsilon_2})} \leq Ct^\eta, \quad 0 \leq k+l \leq 3, \quad (2.112)$$

$$\|r \partial_r w_{rem}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(r \geq \frac{1}{10}t^{1/2-\varepsilon_2})} \leq C\delta^{2\nu}, \quad (2.113)$$

$$\|r^{-l} \partial_r^k w_{rem}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(r \geq \frac{1}{10}t^{1/2-\varepsilon_2})} \leq C(\delta^{2\nu-k-l} + t^{\nu-(k+l)/2+\eta}), \quad 0 \leq k+l \leq 4, \quad (2.114)$$

$$\|r^{-l-1} \partial_r^k w_{rem}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^\infty(r \geq \frac{1}{10}t^{1/2-\varepsilon_2})} \leq C(\delta^{2\nu-6} + t^{\nu-3+\eta}), \quad k+l=5 \quad (2.115)$$

(iii) *The error $A_{rem}^{(N)}(r, t)$ admits the estimate*

$$\|r^{-l} \partial_r^k \partial_t^i A_{rem}^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2(rdr, r \geq \frac{1}{10}t^{1/2-\varepsilon_2})} \leq t^{\varepsilon_2 N}, \quad 0 \leq l+k \leq 3, \quad i = 0, 1, \quad (2.116)$$

provided N is sufficiently large.

2.4.1 Proof of proposition 2.1

We are now in position to finish the proof of proposition 2.1. Fix ε_2 verifying $0 < \varepsilon_2 < \frac{1}{2}$. For $N \geq 2$, define

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{W}_{ex}^{(N)}(\rho, t) &= \theta(t^{\nu-\varepsilon_1}\rho)W_{in}^{(N)}(t^\nu\rho, t) + (1 - \theta(t^{\nu-\varepsilon_1}\rho))\theta(t^{\nu+\varepsilon_2}\rho)W_{ss}^{(N)}(t^\nu\rho, t) \\ &\quad + (1 - \theta(t^{\nu+\varepsilon_2}\rho))e^{-i\alpha(t)}w_{rem}^{(N)}(t^{\nu+1/2}\rho, t), \\ V_{ex}^{(N)}(\rho, t) &= \left(\frac{2 \operatorname{re} \hat{W}_{ex}^{(N)}}{1 + |\hat{W}_{ex}^{(N)}|^2}, \frac{2 \operatorname{im} \hat{W}_{ex}^{(N)}}{1 + |\hat{W}_{ex}^{(N)}|^2}, \frac{1 - |\hat{W}_{ex}^{(N)}|^2}{1 + |\hat{W}_{ex}^{(N)}|^2} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $V_{ex}^{(N)}(\rho, t)$ is well defined for ρ is sufficiently large, and for $\rho < t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1}$ $V_{ex}^{(N)}(\rho, t)$ coincides with $V_{in}^{(N)}(\rho, t)$. Therefore, setting

$$\begin{aligned}V^{(N)}(\rho, t) &= \begin{cases} V_{in}^{(N)}(\rho, t), & \rho \leq \frac{1}{2}t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1}, \\ V_{ex}^{(N)}(\rho, t), & \rho \geq \frac{1}{2}t^{-\nu+\varepsilon_1}. \end{cases} \\ u^{(N)}(x, t) &= e^{(\alpha(t)+\theta)R}V^{(N)}(\lambda(t)|x|, t),\end{aligned}$$

we get a C^∞ 1- equivariant profile $u^{(N)} : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+^* \rightarrow S^2$ that, by lemmas 2.3 (i), 2.7 (ii), 2.10 (ii), for any $N \geq 2$ verifies part (i) of proposition 2.1, ζ_N^* being given by

$$\zeta_N^*(x) = e^{\theta R} \hat{\zeta}_N^*(|x|), \quad \hat{\zeta}_N^* = \left(\frac{2 \operatorname{re} f_0}{1 + |f_0|^2}, \frac{2 \operatorname{im} f_0}{1 + |f_0|^2}, \frac{1 - |f_0|^2}{1 + |f_0|^2} \right).$$

By lemmas 2.3 (ii), 2.7 (i), (iii) and 2.10 (i), (iii), for N sufficiently large the error $r^{(N)} = -u_t^{(N)} + u^{(N)} \times \Delta u^{(N)}$ satisfies

$$\|r^{(N)}(t)\|_{H^3} + \|\partial_t r^{(N)}(t)\|_{H^1} + \|\langle x \rangle r^{(N)}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq t^{\eta N}, \quad t \leq T(N, \delta),$$

with some $\eta = \eta(\nu, \varepsilon_2) > 0$. Re-denoting $N = \frac{N}{\eta}$ we obtain a family of approximate solutions $u^{(N)}(t)$ verifying proposition 2.1.

3 Proof of the theorem

3.1 Main proposition

The proof of theorem 1.1 will be achieved by compactness arguments that rely on the following result. Let $u^{(N)}, T = T(N, \delta)$ be as in proposition 2.1.

Consider the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= u \times \Delta u, \quad t \geq t_1, \\ u|_{t=t_1} &= u^{(N)}(t_1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

with $0 < t_1 < T$.

One has

Proposition 3.1. *For N sufficiently large there exists $0 < t_0 < T$ such that for any $t_1 \in (0, t_0)$ the solution $u(t)$ of (3.1) verifies:*

(i) $u - u^{(N)}$ is in $C([t_1, t_0], H^3)$ and one has

$$\|u(t) - u^{(N)}(t)\|_{H^3} \leq t^{N/2}, \quad \forall t_1 \leq t \leq t_0. \quad (3.2)$$

(ii) Furthermore, $\langle x \rangle (u(t) - u^{(N)}(t)) \in L^2$ and

$$\|\langle x \rangle (u(t) - u^{(N)}(t))\|_{L^2} \leq t^{N/2}, \quad \forall t_1 \leq t \leq t_0. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. The proof is by bootstrap argument. Write

$$u^{(N)}(x, t) = e^{\alpha(t)R} U^{(N)}(\lambda(t)x, t), \quad r^{(N)}(x, t) = \lambda^2(t) e^{\alpha(t)R} R^{(N)}(\lambda(t)x, t)$$

$$u(x, t) = e^{\alpha(t)R} U(\lambda(t)x, t), \quad U(y, t) = U^{(N)}(y, t) + S(y, t),$$

$$U^{(N)}(y, t) = \phi(y) + \chi^{(N)}(y, t).$$

Then $S(t)$ solves

$$t^{1+2\nu} S_t + \alpha_0 t^{2\nu} R S - (\nu + \frac{1}{2}) y \cdot \nabla S = S \times \Delta U^{(N)} + U^{(N)} \times \Delta S + S \times \Delta S + R^{(N)}(t). \quad (3.4)$$

Assume that

$$\|S\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \delta_1, \quad (3.5)$$

with δ_1 sufficiently small. Note that since S is 1-equivariant and

$$(\phi, S) + (\chi^{(N)}, S) + |S|^2 = 0 \quad (3.6)$$

where $\|\chi^{(N)}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C\delta^{2\nu}$ (see (2.5)), the bootstrap assumption (3.5) implies

$$\|S\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C\|\nabla S\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}. \quad (3.7)$$

3.1.1 Energy control

We will first derive a bootstrap control of the energy norm:

$$J_1(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy (|\nabla S|^2 + \kappa(\rho)|S|^2), \quad \rho = |y|.$$

It follows from (3.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} t^{1+2\nu} \frac{d}{dt} J_1(t) &= \mathcal{E}_1 + \mathcal{E}_2 + \mathcal{E}_3 + \mathcal{E}_4, \\ \mathcal{E}_1 &= -2 \int dy (S \times \Delta \chi^{(N)}, \Delta S), \\ \mathcal{E}_2 &= 2 \int dy \kappa(\chi^{(N)} \times \Delta S, S), \\ \mathcal{E}_3 &= -\left(\frac{1}{2} + \nu\right) t^{2\nu} \int dy (2\kappa + \rho\kappa')(S, S), \\ \mathcal{E}_4 &= 2 \int dy [(\nabla R^{(N)}, \nabla S) + \kappa(R^{(N)}, S)]. \end{aligned}$$

From proposition 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}_j| &\leq C t^{2\nu} \|S\|_{H^1}^2, \quad j = 1, \dots, 3, \\ |\mathcal{E}_4| &\leq C t^{N+\nu+1/2} \|\nabla S\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these inequalities we obtain

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} J_1(t) \right| \leq C t^{-1} \|S\|_{H^1}^2 + C t^{2N-1/2-3\nu}. \quad (3.8)$$

3.1.2 Control of the L^2 norm

Consider $J_0(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dy |S|^2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} t^{1+2\nu} \frac{d}{dt} J_0(t) &= \mathcal{E}_5 + \mathcal{E}_6 + \mathcal{E}_7, \\ \mathcal{E}_5 &= 2 \int dy (U^{(N)} \times \Delta S, S), \\ \mathcal{E}_6 &= -2(1 + 2\nu) t^{2\nu} J_0(t), \\ \mathcal{E}_7 &= 2 \int dy (R^{(N)}, S). \end{aligned}$$

Consider $\mathcal{E}_5$. Decomposing $U^{(N)}$ and S in the basis f_1, f_2, Q :

$$U^{(N)}(y, t) = e^{\theta R}((1 + z_3^{(N)}(\rho, t))Q(\rho) + z_1^{(N)}(\rho, t)f_1(\rho) + z_2^{(N)}(\rho, t)f_2(\rho)),$$

$$S(y, t) = e^{\theta R}(\zeta_1(\rho, t)f_1(\rho) + \zeta_2(\rho, t)f_2(\rho) + \zeta_3(\rho, t)Q(\rho)),$$

one can rewrite $\mathcal{E}_5$ as follows.

$$\mathcal{E}_5 = \mathcal{E}_8 + \mathcal{E}_9 + \mathcal{E}_{10},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_8 = -4 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} d\rho \rho \frac{h_1}{\rho} \zeta_2 \partial_\rho \zeta_3,$$

$$\mathcal{E}_9 = -2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} d\rho \rho (\partial_\rho z^{(N)} \times \partial_\rho \zeta, \zeta), \quad z^{(N)} = (z_1^{(N)}, z_2^{(N)}, z_3^{(N)}), \quad \zeta = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3),$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{10} = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} d\rho \rho (z^{(N)} \times l, \zeta),$$

where

$$l = \left(-\frac{1}{\rho^2} \zeta_1 - \frac{2h_1}{\rho} \partial_\rho \zeta_3, -\frac{1}{\rho^2} \zeta_2, \kappa(\rho) \zeta_3 + \frac{2h_1}{\rho} \partial_\rho \zeta_1 - \frac{2h_1 h_3}{\rho^2} \partial_\rho \zeta_1\right).$$

Clearly,

$$|l| \leq C \rho^{-2} (|\zeta| + |\partial_\rho \zeta|).$$

Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{E}_{10}| \leq C t^{2\nu} \|S\|_{H^1}^2. \quad (3.9)$$

Consider $\mathcal{E}_8$. It follows from

$$2(\zeta, \vec{k} + z^{(N)}) + |\zeta|^2 = 0, \quad (3.10)$$

that

$$|\partial_\rho \zeta_3| \leq C(|\partial_\rho z^{(N)}| |\zeta| + |z^{(N)}| |\partial_\rho \zeta| + |\partial_\rho \zeta| |\zeta|).$$

As a consequence,

$$|\mathcal{E}_8| \leq C[t^{2\nu} \|S\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\nabla S\|_{L^2}^3]. \quad (3.11)$$

Consider $\mathcal{E}_9$. Denote $e_0 = \vec{k} + z^{(N)}$ and write $\zeta = \zeta^\perp + \mu e_0$, $\mu = (\zeta, e_0)$. It follows from (3.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu| &\leq C |\zeta|^2, \\ |\mu_\rho| &\leq C |\zeta| |\partial_\rho \zeta|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{E}_9$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{E}_9 = -2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} d\rho \rho (\partial_\rho \zeta^\perp \times \zeta^\perp, \partial_\rho e_0) + O(\|S\|_{H^1}^2 \|\nabla S\|_{L^2}). \quad (3.12)$$

Let e_1, e_2 be a smooth orthonormal basis of the tangent space $T_{e_0}S^2$ that verifies $e_2 = e_0 \times e_1$. Then the expression $(\partial_\rho \zeta^\perp \times \zeta^\perp, \partial_\rho e_0)$ can be written as follows:

$$(\partial_\rho \zeta^\perp \times \zeta^\perp, \partial_\rho e_0) = (\zeta^\perp, \partial_\rho e_0) [(\zeta^\perp, e_2)(\partial_\rho e_0, e_1) - (\zeta^\perp, e_1)(\partial_\rho e_0, e_2)],$$

which leads to the estimate

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} d\rho \rho (\partial_\rho \zeta^\perp \times \zeta^\perp, \partial_\rho e_0) \right| \leq C \|\partial_\rho z^{(N)}\|_{L^\infty}^2 J_0(t) \leq C t^{2\nu} J_0(t). \quad (3.13)$$

Combining (3.9), (3.11), (3.12), (3.13) we obtain

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} J_0(t) \right| \leq C [t^{-1} \|S\|_{H^1}^2 + t^{-1-2\nu} \|S\|_{H^1}^2 \|\nabla S\|_{L^2} + t^{2N-1/2-3\nu}]. \quad (3.14)$$

3.1.3 Control of the weighted L^2 norm

Using (3.4) to compute the derivative $\frac{d}{dt} \|yS(t)\|_{L^2}^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} t^{1+2\nu} \frac{d}{dt} \|yS(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &= -4 \int dy y_i (U^{(N)} \times \partial_i S, S) \\ &\quad - 2 \int dy |y|^2 (\partial_i U^{(N)} \times \partial_i S, S) \\ &\quad - 2(1+2\nu) t^{2\nu} \|yS(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2 \int dy |y|^2 (R^{(N)}, S). \end{aligned}$$

Here and below ∂_j stands for ∂_{y_j} , the summation over the repeated indexes being assumed.

As a consequence, we get

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \|yS(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right| \leq \frac{C}{t} [\|yS(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + t^{-4\nu} \|S\|_{H^1}^2 + t^{2N-2\nu}]. \quad (3.15)$$

3.1.4 Control of the higher regularity

In addition to (3.5), assume that

$$\|S(t)\|_{H^3} + \||y|S(t)\|_{L^2} \leq t^{2N/5}. \quad (3.16)$$

We will control $\dot{H}^3$ norm of the solution by means of $\|\nabla S_t\|_{L^2}$. More precisely, consider the functional

$$J_3(t) = t^{2+4\nu} \int dx |\nabla s_t(x, t)|^2 + t^{1+2\nu} \int dx \kappa(t^{-1/2-\nu}x) |s_t(x, t)|^2,$$

where $s(x, t)$ is defined by

$$s(x, t) = e^{\alpha(t)R} S(\lambda(t)x, t).$$

Write $s_t(x, t) = e^{\alpha(t)R} \lambda^2(t) g(\lambda(t)x, t)$. In terms of g , J_3 can be written as $J_3(t) = \int dy |\nabla g(y, t)|^2 + \int dy \kappa(\rho) |g(y, t)|^2$. Let us compute the derivative $\frac{d}{dt} J_3(t)$. Clearly, $g(y, t)$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} t^{1+2\nu} g_t + \alpha_0 t^{2\nu} Rg - (\nu + \frac{1}{2}) t^{2\nu} (2 + y \cdot \nabla) g = \\ (S + U^{(N)}) \times \Delta g + g \times (\Delta U^{(N)} + \Delta S) \\ + (U^{(N)} \times \Delta U^{(N)} - R^{(N)}) \times \Delta S \\ + S \times \Delta(U^{(N)} \times \Delta U^{(N)} - R^{(N)}) + t^{2+4\nu} r_t^{(N)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} t^{1+2\nu} \frac{d}{dt} J_3(t) = (2 + 4\nu) t^{2\nu} \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}^2 + (\frac{1}{2} + \nu) t^{2\nu} \int (2\kappa - \rho\kappa') |g|^2 dy \\ + E_1 + E_2 + E_3 + E_4 + E_5, \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where

$$E_1 = -2 \int dy (g \times \Delta \chi^{(N)}, \Delta g) + 2 \int dy \kappa(\chi^{(N)}) \times \Delta g, g),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
E_2 &= -2 \int dy ((U^{(N)} \times \Delta U^{(N)} - R^{(N)}) \times \Delta S, \Delta g) \\
&\quad + 2 \int dy (\Delta(U^{(N)} \times \Delta U^{(N)} - R^{(N)}) \times S, \Delta g) \\
&\quad + 2 \int dy \kappa((U^{(N)} \times \Delta U^{(N)} - R^{(N)}) \times \Delta S, g) \\
&\quad - 2 \int dy \kappa(\Delta(U^{(N)} \times \Delta U^{(N)} - R^{(N)}) \times S, g), \\
E_3 &= -2 \int dy (g \times \Delta S, \Delta g), \\
E_4 &= 2 \int dy \kappa(S \times \Delta g, g), \\
E_5 &= -2t^{2+4\nu} \int dy(r_t, \Delta g) + 2t^{2+4\nu} \int dy \kappa(r_t, g).
\end{aligned}$$

The terms E_j , $j = 1, 4, 5$ can be estimated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
|E_1| &\leq Ct^{2\nu} \|g\|_{H^1}^2, \\
|E_4| &\leq C \|g\|_{H^1}^2 \|S\|_{H^3} \leq Ct^{2\nu} \|g\|_{H^1}^2, \\
|E_5| &\leq C(t^{2\nu} \|g\|_{H^1}^2 + t^{2N+3+4\nu}),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

provided N is sufficiently large and $t \leq t_0$ with some $t_0 = t_0(N) > 0$.

For E_2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|E_2| &\leq C(\|\Delta \chi^{(N)}\|_{W^{2,\infty}} + \|R^{(N)}\|_{H^3}) \|g\|_{H^1} \|S\|_{H^3} \\
&\quad + C\|<y>^{-1} \nabla \Delta^2 \chi^{(N)}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla g\|_{L^2} \|<y> S\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$|E_2| \leq Ct^{2\nu} (\|g\|_{H^1} \|S\|_{H^3} + \|\nabla g\|_{L^2} \|<y> S\|_{L^2}). \tag{3.20}$$

Note that since

$$g = (U^{(N)} + S) \times \Delta S + S \times \Delta U^{(N)} + R^{(N)}, \tag{3.21}$$

the bootstrap assumption (3.16) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|S\|_{H^2} + \|R^{(N)}\|_{L^2}), \\
\|\nabla g\|_{L^2} &\leq C(\|S\|_{H^3} + \|\nabla R^{(N)}\|_{L^2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Therefore, (3.19), (3.20) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} |E_1| + |E_2| + |E_4| + |E_5| &\leq Ct^{2\nu}[\|S\|_{H^3}^2 + (\|S\|_{H^3} + t^{N+1+2\nu})\| <y> S\|_{L^2}] \\ &\quad + Ct^{2N+1+4\nu}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Consider E_3 . One has

$$\begin{aligned} g \times \Delta S &= (U^{(N)} + S, \Delta S) \Delta S - |\Delta S|^2 (U^{(N)} + S) \\ &\quad + (S \times \Delta U^{(N)} + R^{(N)}) \times \Delta S, \\ \Delta g &= (U^{(N)} + S) \times \Delta^2 S + Y, \\ Y &= 2(\partial_j U^{(N)} + \partial_j S) \times \Delta \partial_j S + S \times \Delta^2 U^{(N)} \\ &\quad + 2\partial_j S \times \Delta \partial_j U^{(N)} + \Delta R^{(N)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

Therefore, one can write E_3 as $E_3 = E_6 + E_7 + E_8$, where

$$\begin{aligned} E_6 &= -2 \int dy (U^{(N)} + S, \Delta S) (\Delta S, \Delta g), \\ E_7 &= 2 \int dy |\Delta S|^2 (U^{(N)} + S, \Delta g) = 2 \int dy |\Delta S|^2 (U^{(N)} + S, Y), \\ E_8 &= -2 \int dy ((S \times \Delta U^{(N)} + R^{(N)}) \times \Delta S, \Delta g). \end{aligned}$$

For E_6 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E_6 &= 2 \int dy [(\Delta U^{(N)}, S) + 2(\partial_j U^{(N)}, \partial_j S) + (\partial_j S, \partial_j S)] (\Delta S, \Delta g) \\ &= -2 \int dy [(\Delta U^{(N)}, S) + 2(\partial_j U^{(N)}, \partial_j S) + (\partial_j S, \partial_j S)] (\Delta \partial_k S, \partial_k g) \\ &\quad - 2 \int dy (\Delta S, \partial_k g) \partial_k [(\Delta U^{(N)}, S) + 2(\partial_j U^{(N)}, \partial_j S) + (\partial_j S, \partial_j S)]. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, one obtains:

$$|E_6| \leq C \|S\|_{H^3}^2 \|g\|_{H^1} \leq Ct^{2\nu} \|S\|_{H^3}^2. \quad (3.25)$$

Consider E_7 . From (3.24) we have

$$\|Y\|_{L^2} \leq C(\|S\|_{H^3} + t^N).$$

Therefore, we obtain:

$$|E_7| \leq Ct^{2\nu} \|S\|_{H^3}^2. \quad (3.26)$$

Finally, E_8 can be estimated as follows

$$|E_8| \leq C\|g\|_{H^1}(\|S\|_{H^3}^2 + t^N\|S\|_{H^3}) \leq Ct^{2\nu}\|S\|_{H^3}^2 + Ct^{3N}. \quad (3.27)$$

Combining (3.25), (3.27), (3.26) we get

$$|E_3| \leq C(t^{2\nu}\|S\|_{H^3}^2 + t^{3N}), \quad (3.28)$$

which together with (3.23) gives

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} J_3(t) \right| \leq \frac{C}{t} [\|S\|_{H^3}^2 + (\|S\|_{H^3} + t^{N+1+2\nu})\|y|S\|_{L^2}] + Ct^{2N+2\nu}. \quad (3.29)$$

3.1.5 Proof of proposition 3.1

To prove the proposition it is sufficient to show that (3.5), (3.16) implies (3.2), (3.3).

Under the bootstrap assumption (3.16), (3.8), (3.14) become

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} J_1(t) \right| + \left| \frac{d}{dt} J_0(t) \right| \leq Ct^{-1}\|S\|_{H^1}^2 + Ct^{2N-1/2-3\nu}, \quad \forall t \leq t_0, \quad (3.30)$$

provided N is sufficiently large, t_0 sufficiently small.

Note that for $c_0 > 0$ sufficiently large one has $\|S\|_{H^1}^2 \leq J_1 + c_0 J_0$. Therefore, denoting $J(t) = J_1(t) + c_0 J_0(t)$ one can rewrite (3.30) as

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} J(t) \right| \leq Ct^{-1}J(t) + Ct^{2N-1/2-3\nu}. \quad (3.31)$$

Integrating this inequality with zero initial condition at t_1 one gets

$$J(t) \leq \frac{C}{N} t^{2N+1/2-3\nu}, \quad \forall t \in [t_1, t_0], \quad (3.32)$$

provided N is sufficiently large. As a consequence, we obtain

$$\|S\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \frac{C}{N} t^{2N+1/2-3\nu}, \quad \forall t \in [t_1, t_0]. \quad (3.33)$$

Consider $\|y|S(t)\|_{L^2}$. From (3.15), (3.33) we have

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \|y|S(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \right| \leq \frac{C}{t} [\|y|S(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + t^{2N-7\nu}]. \quad (3.34)$$

Integrating this inequality and assuming that N is sufficiently large, we get

$$\| |y|S(t) \|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{C}{N} t^{2N-7\nu}, \quad \forall t \in [t_1, t_0], \quad (3.35)$$

which gives in particular,

$$\| |x|s(t) \|_{L^2}^2 \leq t^{N/2}, \quad \forall t \in [t_1, t_0]. \quad (3.36)$$

We next consider $\| \nabla \Delta s(t) \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}$. It follows from (3.21), (3.16) that for any $j = 1, 2$

$$\| \partial_j g - (U^{(N)} + S) \times \Delta \partial_j S \|_{L^2} \leq C(\|S\|_{H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} + t^{N+1+2\nu}). \quad (3.37)$$

Note also that since $|U^{(N)} + S| = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(U^{(N)} + S) \times \Delta \partial_j S|^2 &= |\Delta \partial_j S|^2 - (U^{(N)} + S, \Delta \partial_j S)^2, \\ (U^{(N)} + S, \Delta \partial_j S) &= -(\Delta U^{(N)} + \Delta S, \partial_j S) - \Delta(\partial_j U^{(N)}, S) \\ &\quad - 2(\partial_k U^{(N)} + \partial_k S, \partial_{jk}^2 S), \end{aligned}$$

which together with (3.16) gives

$$\| \Delta \partial_j S \|_{L^2}^2 - \|(U^{(N)} + S) \times \Delta \partial_j S\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C\|S\|_{H^2}^2. \quad (3.38)$$

Consider the functional $\tilde{J}_3(t) = J_3(t) + c_1 J_0(t)$. It follows from (3.22), (3.37), (3.38) that for $c_1 > 0$ sufficiently large we have

$$c_2 \|S\|_{H^3}^2 - C t^{2N+1+2\nu} \leq \tilde{J}_3(t) \leq C(\|S\|_{H^3}^2 + t^{2N+1+2\nu}), \quad (3.39)$$

with some $c_2 > 0$.

From (3.29), (3.30), (3.35) one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{J}_3(t) \right| &\leq C \left[t^{-1} (\|S\|_{H^3(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \| |y|S \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2) + t^{2N-1/2-3\nu} \right] \\ &\leq C t^{-1} \tilde{J}_3(t) + C t^{2N-7\nu-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

Integrating this inequality between t_1 and t and observing that $\tilde{J}_3(t_1) = t_1^{2+4\nu} \int dx |\nabla r^{(N)}(x, t_1)|^2 + t_1^{1+2\nu} \int dx \kappa(t_1^{-1/2+\nu} x) |r^{(N)}(x, t_1)|^2$, and therefore, $|\tilde{J}_3(t_1)| \leq C t_1^{2N+1+2\nu}$, we obtain

$$\tilde{J}_3(t) \leq C t^{2N-7\nu}, \quad \forall t \in [t_1, t_0].$$

Combining this inequality with (3.39), one gets

$$\|S\|_{H^3(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \leq Ct^{2N-7\nu}, \quad \forall t \in [t_1, t_0],$$

which implies that

$$\|s\|_{H^3(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq t^{N/2}, \quad \forall t \in [t_1, t_0].$$

This concludes the proof of proposition 3.1.

3.2 Proof of the theorem

The proof of the theorem is now straightforward. Fix N such that proposition 3.1 holds. Take a sequence (t^j) , $0 < t^j < t_0$, $t^j \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Let $u_j(x, t)$ be the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u_j &= u_j \times \Delta u_j, \quad t \geq t^j, \\ u_j|_{t=t^j} &= u^{(N)}(t^j), \end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

By proposition 3.1, for any j , $u_j - u^{(N)} \in C([t^j, t_0], H^3)$ and satisfies

$$\|u_j(t) - u^{(N)}(t)\|_{H^3} + \|< x > (u_j(t) - u^{(N)}(t))\|_{L^2} \leq 2t^{N/2}, \quad \forall t \in [t^j, t_0]. \tag{3.42}$$

This implies in particular, that the sequence $u_j(t_0) - u^{(N)}(t_0)$ is compact in H^2 and therefore after passing to a subsequence we can assume that $u_j(t_0) - u^{(N)}(t_0)$ converges in H^2 to some 1-equivariant function $w \in H^3$, with $\|w\|_{H^3} \leq \delta^{2\nu}$, $|u^{(N)}(t_0) + w| = 1$.

Consider the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= u \times \Delta u, \quad t \leq t_0, \\ u|_{t=t_0} &= u^{(N)}(t_0) + w, \end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

By the local well-posedness, (3.43) admits a unique solution $u \in C((t^*, t_0], \dot{H}^1 \cap \dot{H}^3)$ with some $0 \leq t^* < t_0$. By H^1 continuity of the flow (see [10]), $u_j \rightarrow u$ in $C((t^*, t_0], \dot{H}^1)$, which together with (3.42) gives

$$\|u(t) - u^{(N)}(t)\|_{H^3} \leq 2t^{N/2}, \quad \forall t \in (t^*, t_0]. \tag{3.44}$$

This implies that $t^* = 0$ and combined with proposition 2.1 gives the result stated in theorem 1.1.

References

- [1] Angenent S.; Hulshof J., Singularities at $t = \infty$ in equivariant harmonic map flow, Contemp. Math. 367, Geometric evolution equations, 115, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- [2] Van den Bergh, J.; Hulshof, J.; King, J., Formal asymptotics of bubbling in the harmonic map heat flow, SIAM J. Appl. Math. vol 63, o5. pp 1682-1717.
- [3] Bejenaru, I.; Ionescu, A.; Kenig, C.; Tataru, D., Global Schrödinger maps, to appear in Annals of Math.
- [4] Bejenaru, I.; Ionescu, A.; Kenig, C.; Tataru, D., Equivariant Schrödinger maps in two spatial dimensions, arXiv:1112.6122v1.
- [5] Bejenaru, I.; Tataru, D., Near soliton evolution for equivariant Schrödinger Maps in two spatial dimensions, arXiv:1009.1608.
- [6] Chang, N-H.; Shatah, J.; Uhlenbeck, K., Schrödinger maps, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 53 (2000), no 5, 590-602.
- [7] Grillakis, M.; Stefanopoulos, V., Lagrangian formulation, energy estimates and the Schrödinger map problem, Comm PDE 27 (2002), 1845-1877.
- [8] Grotowski, J.; Shatah, J. Geometric evolution equations in critical dimensions. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 30 (2007), no. 4, 499-512.
- [9] Gustafson, S.; Kang, K.; Tsai, T-P.; Schrödinger flow near harmonic maps; Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 60 (2007), no. 4, 463-499.
- [10] Gustafson, S.; Kang, K.; Tsai, T-P.; Asymptotic stability of harmonic maps under the Schrödinger flow.; Duke Math. J. 145 no. 3 (2008) 537-583.
- [11] Gustafson, S.; Koo, E.; Global well-posedness for $2D$ radial Schrödinger maps into the sphere, arXiv:1105.5659.

- [12] Gustafson, S.; Nakanishi, K.; Tsai, T-P.; Asymptotic stability, concentration and oscillations in harmonic map heat flow, Landau Lifschitz and Schrödinger maps on $\mathbb{R}^2$; *Comm. Math. Phys.* (2010), 300, no 1, 205-242.
- [13] Krieger, J.; Schlag, W.; Tataru, D., Renormalization and blow up for charge one equivariant critical wave maps. *Invent. Math.* 171 (2008), no. 3, 543-615.
- [14] McGahagan, H., An approximation scheme for Schrödinger maps, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 32 (2007), 375-401.
- [15] Merle F.; Raphaël P.; Rodnianski, I., Blow up dynamics for smooth equivariant solutions to the energy critical Schrödinger map, *arXiv:1106.0912*.
- [16] A. Nahmod, A. Stefanov, K. Uhlenbeck, On Schrödinger maps, *CPAM* 56(2003), 114-151.
- [17] Raphaël, P.; Rodnianski, I., Stable blow up dynamics for the critical corotational wave maps and equivariant Yang Mills problems, to appear in *Prep. Math. IHES*.
- [18] Sulem, P.L; Sulem, C.; Bardos, C., On the continuous limit for a system of continuous spins, *Comm. Math. Phys* 107 (1986), no 3, 431-454.
- [19] Struwe, M., On the evolution of harmonic mappings of Riemannian surfaces, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 60 (1985), no. 4, 558-581.